Department of Housing Preservation & Development
nyc.gov/hpd

VICKI BEEN
Commissioner
ERIC ENDERLIN
Deputy Commissioner
JOHN GEARRITY
Associate Commissioner

Office of Development
Building and Land Development Services
100 Gold Street
New York, N.Y. 10038

September 9, 2016

NOTICE OF COMPLETION AND NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF A FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Lambert Houses Redevelopment

Project Identification:
CEQR No. 16HPD001X
CEQ No. 20160138

ULURP Nos.
160285 ZMX
160286 HAX
N 160287 ZAX
N 160288 ZRX
N 160289 ZRX
160290 ZSX
M 160291 ZSX
160218MMX

Lead Agency / Responsible Entity:
City of New York - Department of Housing Preservation &Development (HPD)
100 Gold Street
New York, NY 10038

Contact Person:
Aaron Werner, AICP
Director of Environmental Planning, HPD
(212) 863-5953
wernera@hpd.nyc.gov

SEQRA Classification: Type I

This provides notice to the public and relevant agencies that the City of New York – Department of Housing Preservation & Development (HPD) serving as Lead Agency in accordance with City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR), Executive Order No. 91, and the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), 6 NYCRR 617; and serving as the Responsible Entity (RE) in accordance with 24 CFR 58.2(a)(7), has prepared a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Lambert Houses Redevelopment Project. Copies of the FEIS are available for public inspection at the office of the undersigned.

The FEIS is a joint National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and CEQR document. The FEIS satisfies requirements of SEQR (6 NYCRR 617.8) and CEQR (Sections 6-08 and 6-12 of Executive Order No. 91 of 1977 as amended), which require that state and local government agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority before acting on those projects. The Proposed Project is subject to NEPA because it involves approval by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for the reassignment of project-based rental assistance contracts, and the Proposed Project may also request other funding from HUD in the future. The FEIS serves as a NEPA document intended to satisfy requirements of federal environmental statutes. In accordance with specific statutory authority and HUD's regulations at 24 CFR part 58 (Environmental

Review Procedures for Entities Assuming HUD Environmental Responsibilities), HUD has provided for assumption of its NEPA authority and NEPA lead agency responsibility to HPD. The FEIS also serves as a CEQR document intended to satisfy State and City environmental statutes as described above. This notice has been prepared in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations at 40 CFR parts 1500-1508.

A Notice of Completion for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) was issued on April 22, 2016 and a public hearing on the DEIS was held at Spector Hall, 22 Reade Street, New York, New York on August 10, 2016 in conjunction with the City Planning Commission's (CPC) hearing pursuant to the Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP). Comments on the DEIS were accepted by HPD until August 22, 2016. Since the proposal is subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the DEIS public hearing notice published on July 20, 2016 included a request for any individuals and/or organizations interested in participating as Section 106 Consulting Parties to indicate such interest at the public hearing or through written correspondence to Lead Agency no later than August 22, 2016. No comments were received with regard to the Section 106 process. The FEIS reflects all substantive comments made on the DEIS during the public hearing and subsequent comment period and additional or revised analyses conducted subsequent to the completion of the DEIS.

A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

HPD and Phipps Houses (the "Applicants"), are seeking approval of several discretionary actions subject to CPC approval (collectively, the "Proposed Actions") including zoning map amendments, the modification of a previously-approved Large Scale Residential District (LSRD), special permits, the disposition of City-owned property, Urban Development Action Area Project (UDAAP) designation and approval, authorizations, and zoning text amendments.

The Proposed Actions would facilitate the phased demolition and redevelopment of Lambert Houses, an existing residential and commercial development occupying approximately 12 acres in the West Farms neighborhood of the Bronx, New York (the "Proposed Project"). The "Development Site" is defined herein as parcels 1, 3, 5, and 10 in the northern section of the current Bronx Park South LSRD (the LSRD also includes five additional parcels: 6, 7, 8a, 8b, and 9). In total, the approximately 12-acre Development Site currently contains five groupings of six-story buildings containing 731 residential units, and one two-story building containing approximately 39,490 square feet (sf) of retail use and 375 parking spaces (See **Table 1**).

Parcel 1 (Block 3138, Lot 1) is an approximately 2.9-acre parcel located along the west side of Boston Road between East 180th Street and Bronx Park South and is comprised of a group of four interconnected six-story buildings containing 237 residential units.

Parcel 3 (Block 3132, Lot 1) is an approximately 4.5-acre parcel located along the west side of Boston Road between East 179th and East 180th Streets which currently contains 325 residential units in seven interconnected six-story buildings.

Parcel 5 (Block 3140, Lot 7) is an approximately 1.8-acre parcel located at the southeast corner of Boston Road and East 180th Street which currently contains 169 residential units in a group of three interconnected six-story buildings.

Parcel 10 (Block 3139, Lots 1 and 19) is an approximately 2.5-acre parcel bounded to the west by Boston Road, to the south by East Tremont Avenue, to the east by the Bronx River and proposed Bronx River Greenway, and to the north by East 179th Street. Parcel 10 currently contains one two-story building containing approximately 39,490 sf of retail uses and a 375-space parking garage. An approximately

3,720-sf City-owned lot (Block 3139, Lot 50) just south of Parcel 10 would be conveyed to Phipps Houses and become part of Parcel 10. This lot currently contains seating, trees and plantings.

Table 1
Existing Conditions

Existing Conditions				
Parcel	**Residential (units)**	**Retail (sf)**	**Community Facility (sf)[1]**	**Parking (spaces)**
1	237	0	0	0
3	325	0	2,250	0
5	169	0	0	0
10	0	39,490	0	375
Total	**731**	**39,490**	**2,250**	**375**

Note: 1. There is an early education facility currently located on Parcel 3.
Source: Phipps Houses

The Proposed Project involves the demolition of the existing Lambert Houses buildings and the redevelopment of the Development Site with approximately 1,665 new affordable residential units, approximately 61,100 sf of retail space, and a possible elementary school of up to approximately 86,608 sf. Construction of the Proposed Project has a Build Year of 2029, as construction would occur over a period of approximately 13 years. During construction of the Proposed Project, current tenants would be relocated from buildings to be demolished to other locations within the Lambert Houses development. Once relocated, the unoccupied buildings would be demolished and construction of new buildings would proceed. Tenants of the next buildings to be demolished would be relocated within the Lambert Houses Development Site to the newly constructed buildings, and the demolition and construction process would begin again. This process would be repeated through completion of the Proposed Project. Overall, the Proposed Project would redevelop the Development Site with the following (See **Table 2**):

- A total of approximately 1,665 residential units at the completion of the project, for an incremental increase of approximately 934 units over the No Action condition. The proposed residential units would all be affordable.
- Approximately 61,100 sf of retail space, for an increment of 21,610 sf over the No-Action condition.
- A new public school of approximately 86,608 sf on a portion of Parcel 10. It is expected that this school would be a 500-seat elementary school.
- A reduction in the amount of on-street parking required in the Development Site, for a total of 110 spaces.

In order to address a projected shortfall of seats in the Development Site's public schools, the New York City School Construction Authority (SCA) will be given an option to acquire the site of the proposed school (portion of Parcel 10) for a nominal fee. Phipps and HPD are in discussions with the SCA and will continue to work with SCA to determine appropriate terms for the proposed 500-seat elementary school as the phased project is constructed. It is anticipated that these terms will be formalized in a Letter of Intent (LOI). If SCA were to decline to exercise this option and construct the school, a residential building with approximately 55 units would be constructed in its place. The environmental impacts of the scenario in which a residential building would replace the school are analyzed in the Alternatives chapter of the FEIS and summarized below under Section E - Alternatives.

Table 2
Proposed Project - Summary

Parcel	Building	Lot Area (sf)	Gross Floor Area (sf)	Zoning Floor Area (sf)	Dwelling Units
1	1A	126,395	148,846	34,590	135
	1B		114,473	111,038	104
	1C		178,363	173,012	162
	1D		101,795	98,742	93
			543,477	**527,173**	**494**
3	3A	197,178	162,241	157,373	147
	3B		94,965	92,116	89
	3C		149,846	145,351	136
	3D		173,125	167,932	156
	3E		83,092	80,599	76
	3F		146,335	141,945	133
			809,605	**785,316**	**737**
5	5A	79,612	180,872	175,446	164
	5B		151,052	146, 520	137
			331,924	321,966	301
10	10A	111,545	146,477	142, 083	133
			146,477	**142, 083**	**133**
		Total Residential Area:	**1,831,483**	**1,776,539**	**1,665**
10	Retail	111,545	21,931	21,273	
	School		86,608	84,010	
	Supermarket		22,637	21,958	
			131,176	**127,241**	
		Total Non-Residential Area:	**131,176**	**127,241**	
		Total Area:	**1,962,659**	**1,903,780**	

Source: Phipps Houses

REDEVELOPMENT OF PARCEL 1

Parcel 1 would include four new buildings, identified as Buildings 1A through 1D, ranging from seven to 15 stories in height and with a total of approximately 494 residential units. With the reintroduction of East 181st Street through the Development Site, Parcel 1 would be divided into two blocks. The northern block would have an L-shaped building (Building 1A) with frontage on Bronx Park South and Boston Road. The building would reach a height of seven and eight stories along most of the Bronx Park South and Boston Road frontages, with a portion of the building rising to 15 stories where these two streets meet. The southern section of Parcel 1 would have three buildings (Buildings 1B, 1C and 1D) arranged around a courtyard. Building 1B, on the south side of East 181 Street, would have heights of seven and 11 stories and the two buildings (Building 1C and 1D) along the north side of East 180th Street would have heights stepping up from seven to 13 stories.

The demapped segments of Bryant Avenue and East 181st Street that fall within Parcel 1 would be reconstructed as privately owned, unmapped streets open to pedestrian and vehicular traffic; approximately 35 accessory parking spaces would be created along the streets. The existing utility easements that correspond to these two new street segments would be continued.

Maisonette[1] units would be constructed on the ground floor of Building 1B along East 181st Street, Building 1D along Bryant Avenue, and Buildings 1C and 1D along East 180th Street to enliven these frontages and activate the streetscape. These units would have individual entrances along the street and would span the ground floor and the second floor street frontage. The Boston Road frontages of Buildings 1A and 1C would include ground floor spaces for retail or community facility use.

[1] Maisonette apartments are individual units that each have their own entrance and are part of a larger building.

REDEVELOPMENT OF PARCEL 3

Six new buildings (Buildings 3A through 3F) with a total of approximately 737 units would be constructed on Parcel 3. These buildings would be arranged in two groups (Building 3A and 3F to the west and 3B, 3C, 3D and 3E to the east) centered around courtyards on either side of a newly created segment of Bryant Avenue. Bryant Avenue would be extended through Parcel 3 in the existing easement area between East 179th and East 180th Streets. Like the new street segments on Parcel 1, this segment of Bryant Avenue would be an unmapped privately-owned street that is open to pedestrian and vehicular traffic. Approximately 25 accessory parking spaces would be created along this street segment.

Buildings 3C and 3D along Boston Road would have base heights of eight and nine stories, with setback portions rising to 13 and 14 stories. Ground floor spaces for retail or community facility use totaling 6,000 square feet would be located along Boston Road at the corners of East 179th and East 180th Streets.

Maisonette units would activate the street frontages along East 180th Street, Bryant Avenue, and East 179th Street. Buildings 3B and 3E along the eastern side of the new segment of Bryant Avenue would have base heights of six and eight stories and overall heights of eight and ten stories.

On the west side of Bryant Avenue, Buildings 3A and 3F would have base heights of six to seven stories. Building F, on the south side of the block along East 179th Street, would reach a total of nine stories, while Building A, on East 180th Street, would have a maximum height of 18 stories. The greater height for Building 3A is necessary to accommodate the overall project's construction phasing, as this will be first building constructed and must accommodate the relocation of residents for the next phase of development.

REDEVELOPMENT OF PARCEL 5

Two new buildings (Buildings 5A and 5B) with a total of approximately 301 units would be constructed on Parcel 5. Building 5A, the taller building, would front on Boston Road, with a base height of eight stories, consistent with that of the building across the street on Parcel 3. The overall height of this building would rise to 16 stories at the intersection of Boston Road and East 180th Street. Building 5B, on the eastern portion of Parcel 5, would have a maximum overall height of 16 stories and would step down toward the Bronx River to seven stories. Maisonette units would be constructed at the ground floor level of both buildings along East 180th Streets. An interior courtyard between the buildings would be accessed from Boston Road.

REDEVELOPMENT OF PARCEL 10

Parcel 10 would be developed with a mixed-use building containing approximately 44,568 square feet of retail space on the ground floor and approximately 133 residential units above. The building would have a base height of five stories and the upper portion would step up toward the east, increasing from nine to 16 stories, so as to step back from the elevated subway tracks along Boston Road.

New retail space would be created at the corner of Boston Road and East Tremont Avenue, where subway and bus stops create high levels of pedestrian activity. The new retail space would have higher floor to ceiling heights than the existing retail space at the location to improve access to and visibility from the adjacent streets. Approximately 50 accessory parking spaces would be located on the roof of the retail space in the one-story portion of the building along Boston Road.

As described above, at the eastern edge of Parcel 10, where the Bronx River Greenway intersects with East Tremont Avenue, the SCA will be given an option to acquire the site of the proposed school (portion of Parcel 10) for a nominal fee. Phipps and HPD are in discussions with the SCA and will continue to work with SCA to determine appropriate terms for the proposed 500-seat elementary school as the phased project is constructed. It is anticipated that these terms will be formalized in a Letter of Intent (LOI). If SCA were to decline to exercise this option and construct the school, a residential building with approximately 55 units would be constructed in its place. The environmental impacts of the scenario in which a residential building would replace the school are analyzed in the "Alternatives" chapter of the FEIS and summarized below under Section E – "Alternatives."

BACKGROUND

The current Lambert Houses development consists of 14 residential buildings and a commercial complex situated on approximately 12 acres of land in the former Bronx Park South Urban Renewal Area. Constructed between 1970 and 1973, it is owned by an affiliate of Phipps Houses. The residential buildings contain a total of 731 units in interconnected groups on the blocks bounded by Bronx Park South, Vyse Avenue, East 179th Street, and the Bronx River. All of the residential units at Lambert Houses are included in a series of three Project–Based Section 8 contracts. The commercial building, which includes approximately 40,000 square feet of retail and office space in addition to a parking garage, is located on the block bounded by East Tremont Avenue, Boston Road, East 179th Street, and the Bronx River.

The Development Site land was acquired through eminent domain by the City of New York under the Bronx Park South Urban Renewal Plan and conveyed to Lambert Houses Redevelopment Company for nominal consideration. The land was subject to a Land Disposition Agreement, which required the conformance of the project to the Bronx Park South Urban Renewal Plan. The Development Site, along with several parcels on the blocks to the south and west, is part of the LSRD and governed by the Bronx Park South Large Scale Plan, created in 1969 and revised in 1970. The other properties within the LSRD included the New York Housing Authority's ("NYCHA") 1010 East 178 Street development and the New York Association of Catholic Homes' and Fordham Bedford Housing Corporation's West Farms Square development. Since the Bronx Park South Urban Renewal Plan is now expired, the Bronx Park South Large Scale Plan remains the only land use control on the Development Site other than zoning.

The existing Lambert Houses buildings have numerous planning, design, and construction flaws that make them difficult and expensive to operate; for this reason demolition of the current structures and construction of new buildings is the best and most cost efficient way to improve conditions at Lambert and maximize the opportunity to create affordable housing. Lambert currently consists of six mega-structures on superblocks with 14 address and 42 means of entry and egress. Addresses within a structure interconnect at common fire stairs that act as a "joint" that connects extremely long, narrow hallways. Duplex apartments were created in the top two floors of several buildings, resulting in an entire, unsupervised top-floor corridor that exists only to provide fire egress for the upper floor bedrooms. The structures are set back from the street, creating large undefined, unprogrammed open spaces at the property line, and the lack of street walls impedes street activity. Unvaried building heights and uniform facades create monotony while multiple, undifferentiated entries make way-finding difficult.

Lambert's commercial complex, located on the southernmost block of the Development Site, offers retail spaces that are antiquated and not optimally designed for merchants or customers. The storefronts are

significantly set back from the street wall in many locations and have poor frontage and inadequate storage space for merchants. A dark central "courtyard" at the center of this block, partially covered by the deck of the parking garage, creates unappealing, ungovernable open space that is difficult to secure and poses a nuisance. While Lambert's commercial space is situated at a busy intersection of East Tremont Avenue and Boston Road, it is poorly configured for either neighborhood retail users or destination retail users and thus is a lost opportunity at a location that could potentially support better retail options for neighborhood residents.

PURPOSE AND NEED

The current Lambert Houses development is the product of an urban renewal initiative undertaken by the City of New York. The Development Site land was acquired through eminent domain by the City in 1970 under the Bronx Park South Urban Renewal Plan and conveyed to Lambert Houses Redevelopment Company, a Phipps Houses entity, for nominal consideration. The land was subject to a Land Disposition Agreement, which required the conformance of the project to the Bronx Park South Urban Renewal Plan, which was adopted in 1965, revised in 1989 and 1998, and has since expired. The goal of the plan was to revitalize the neighborhood through strategic redevelopment of blighted, vacant, or underutilized parcels. The Bronx Park South Large Scale Residential Development (LSRD) was created to facilitate the development, and the Development Site was designated as Parcels 1, 3 5, and 10 of the LSRD that encompasses the Urban Renewal Area. Since the Bronx Park South Urban Renewal Plan is now expired, the Bronx Park South Large Scale Plan remains the only land use control on the Development Site other than zoning.

The Proposed Project is intended to improve the quality of life for current Lambert Houses residents while increasing the number of affordable housing units on the Development Site. The Development Site is underdeveloped, with less floor area than even the current zoning districts allow, and less density than much of the surrounding neighborhood. The Development Site buildings were constructed between 1970 and 1973 and have outdated and inefficient building systems. Furthermore, the configuration and circulation plan of the buildings, with multiple entrances and egresses, compromise building security by making control of access difficult. The retail space currently on the site is poorly designed, with storefronts set back far from the street wall, little or no street frontage, and inadequate storage space for merchants.

The Proposed Project would increase density of development on the Development Site and more than double the number of affordable housing units, with ancillary commercial and community facility space. By creating nearly 1,000 more affordable housing units than are currently located on the site, the Proposed Project would make a substantial contribution to the housing production goals of the Mayor's *Housing New York: A Five-Borough, Ten-Year Plan*.

The proposed site plan would allow for buildings with fewer, securable points of access/egress, better fire egress, and improved security. It would better integrate Lambert Houses into the surrounding neighborhood by creating a street wall with ground floor uses such as retail and maisonette apartments that activate the streetscape. The Proposed Project would include more affordable housing units and retail space with a more efficient configuration to better serve neighborhood needs. It would also result in improved open space for current and future residents, and would replace the existing inefficient building systems with modern, more efficient systems. The new buildings would meet current water and energy codes and as required by HPD funding, they would meet Enterprise Green Communities criteria, which mandate energy efficiency and water conservation.

B. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTIONS

Implementation of the Proposed Project would require the following discretionary actions, which are subject to ULURP:

- Modification of the previously approved LSRD. The Proposed Actions would remove Lambert Houses (consisting of Parcels 1, 3, 5, 10) from the LSRD. The remainder of the Bronx Park South LSRD (consisting of Parcels 6, 7, 8a, 8b, and 9) would remain in the modified LSRD.[2] Modification of the previously-approved LSRD would require a new Special Permit pursuant to ZR Section 78-312 for minor variations in the height and setback to ensure that no new non-compliances with respect to height and setback will be created on the periphery.

  The proposed modification to the previously approved LSRD would cause the areas within the modified LSRD along the south side of East 179th Street and the west side of Boston Road to become areas on the periphery of rather than wholly within the LSRD. To avoid new noncompliance within the modified LSRD, the Applicants are seeking a Special Permit pursuant to ZR 78-312:

  - Parcel 6: Along the south side of East 179th Street, an existing building with a height of approximately 67.26 feet rises without setback at the property line. The R7-1 zoning at this location on a narrow street has a maximum base height of 60 feet within a setback distance of 20 feet, after which a sky exposure plane of 2.7:1 applies. A Special Permit is requested to allow the existing building to exceed the maximum base height by approximately 7 feet and to penetrate the sky exposure plane in this area.
  - Parcel 7: The portion of the existing residential building on the south side of East 179th Street rises to a height of approximately 67.26 feet rises without setback at the property line in an area zoned R7-1. A Special Permit is requested to allow the existing building to exceed the maximum allowed base height of 60 feet within 20 feet of the street by approximately 7 feet and to penetrate the sky exposure plane in this area.
- Urban Development Action Area Project (UDAAP) Designation and Project Approval and disposition of City-owned property. The small City-owned triangular parcel at the intersection of East Tremont Avenue and Boston Road (Block 3139, Lot 50) would be designated a UDAAP and would be disposed to Phipps Houses for incorporation into the Development Site.
- City map amendment to remove Lot 50 from the mapped street.
- Zoning Map Amendment to change portions of the development site from R7-1 and Parcel 10 from R7-1/C1-4 as follows:
  - Parcel 1: R8 with a depth of 100 ft. parallel to Boston Road, Bronx Park South and East 180th Street. C1-4 overlay with a depth of 100 ft. parallel to Boston Road. R7-1 to remain on the balance of the parcel.
  - Parcel 3: R8 with a depth of 100 ft. parallel to Boston Road and a depth of 120 ft. parallel to East 180th Street. C1-4 overlay with a depth of 100 ft. parallel to Boston Road. R7-1 to remain on the balance of the parcel.
  - Parcel 5: R8 with a depth of 100 ft. parallel to Boston Road and East 180th Street. R7-1 to remain on the balance of the parcel.
  - Parcel 10: R8 / C1-4 overlay.

[2] There is currently a proposal for a new residential development, sponsored by the Second Farms Neighborhood HDFC for Parcel 9 in the LSRD.

- Authorizations under ZR Section 78-311 to allow the following within the new LSRD (these authorizations are described in greater detail in FEIS Chapter 8, "Urban Design and Visual Resources"):
  - 78-311(a): To permit distribution of the total floor area permitted by the applicable district regulations without regard for zoning lot lines or zoning district boundaries. This would enable the transfer of 76,000 sf of surplus floor area on Parcel 3 from the R7-1 district to the R8/C1-4 district, and 26,497 sf of surplus floor area on Parcel 5 from the R7-1 district to the R8 district.
  - 78-311(b): To permit the total open space required by the applicable district regulations to be distributed without regard for zoning lot lines or zoning district boundaries. This would allow 12,740 sf of open space to be transferred from an R7-1 district to an R8/C1-4 within Parcel 1 and 17,428 sf of open space to be transferred from an R7-1 district to an R8/C1-4 within Parcel 3. Within Parcel 5, 6,745 sf of open space would be transferred from an R7-1 district to an R8.
  - 78-311(d): To modify the required rear yard setback for tall buildings per Section 23-663 for Buildings 3A and 3C on Parcel 3.
  - 78-311(e): To permit variations in the front height and setback regulations including variation in the maximum height and number of stories of the front wall within the initial setback distance, modification of the initial setback distance, and to permit penetration of the sky exposure plane in areas wholly within the LSRD.
  - 78-311(h): To permit an interim condition in which the minimum distance between buildings is waived between the new Building 3A and the existing building to the south. The interim waiver will no longer be needed once the new Building 3F is demolished.
- Zoning text amendment to ZR 78-312 to establish that in R7-1and R8 Districts within Community District 6 in the Borough of the Bronx where a lot line abuts a public park, such lot line may by Special Permit of the City Planning Commission be considered a street line for the purposes of applying the requirements of Section 23-86 (Minimum Distance Between Legally Required Windows and Walls or Lot Lines).
- Special Permit pursuant to ZR 78-312 for minor variations in the height and setback regulations on the periphery of the new LSRD and to permit a lot line abutting a public park to be considered a street line for the purposes of applying the requirements of Section 23-86 (Minimum Distance Between Legally Required Windows and Walls or Lot Lines).
- Zoning text amendment to Appendix F to designate the Development Site as a Mandatory Inclusionary Housing Area.
- Coastal zone consistency determination.
- Site plan approval by the Mayor and City Council pursuant to SCA requirements for the proposed school on Parcel 10.

The Proposed Project may also utilize funding from City and/or State agencies including HPD, HDC, HFA, and/or HCR for affordable housing construction. In addition, the Proposed Project would require approval by HUD of the reassignment of project-based rental assistance contracts, and the Proposed Project may also request HOME funds or other construction financing originating from HUD in the future.

As the Proposed Project is built out over time, the landscape plans for each parcel will require certification from the Chair of the New York City Planning Commission (CPC).

In connection with the Proposed Project, a Restrictive Declaration would be recorded at the time all land use-related actions required to authorize the Proposed Project are approved. The Restrictive Declaration would, among other things:

- Require development in substantial conformance with the approved plans, which establish an envelope within which the buildings must be constructed, including limitations on floor area;
- Require that the Proposed Project's development program be within the scope of the development scenario analyzed in the FEIS; and
- Provide for the implementation of "Project Components Related to the Environment" (i.e., certain project components which were material to the analysis of environmental impacts in the FEIS) and mitigation measures, substantially consistent with the FEIS.

CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE

Construction of the Proposed Project would occur over a build out period of approximately 13 years. Construction is anticipated to begin in January 2017 and be complete in September 2029 (See **Table 3**).

During construction of the Proposed Project, current tenants would be relocated from buildings to be demolished to other locations within the Lambert Houses development. Once relocated, the unoccupied buildings would be demolished and construction of new buildings would proceed. Tenants of the next buildings to be demolished would be relocated within the Lambert Houses Development Site to the newly constructed buildings, and the demolition and new construction process would begin again. This process would be repeated through completion of the project. Construction activities would be divided into five building groups, beginning at Parcel 3 with the construction of Building 3A, followed by activities at Parcel 5 with the construction of Buildings 5A and 5B, Parcel 1 with the construction of Buildings 1A through 1D, Parcel 3 with the construction of 3B through 3F, and finally Building 10 (as well as the proposed school) at Parcel 10.

Table 3
Preliminary Construction Schedule

Building	Activity	Approximate Start Month	Approximate Finish Month	Approximate Duration (months)
3A	Demolition	January 2017	March 2017	3
	Building Construction	April 2017	December 2018	21
	Relocation	January 2019	November 2019	10
5A, 5B	Demolition	December 2019	February 2020	3
	Building Construction	March 2020	November 2021	21
	Relocation	December 2021	September 2022	10
1A, 1B, 1C, and 1D	Demolition	October 2022	December 2022	3
	Building Construction	January 2023	September 2024	21
	Relocation	October 2024	August 2025	10
3B, 3C, 3D, 3E, 3F	Demolition	September 2025	November 2025	3
	Building Construction	December 2025	August 2027	21
10	Demolition	September 2027	November 2027	3
	Building Construction	December 2027	September 2029	21

Source: Phipps Houses

C. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK

The 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual* serves as guidance on the methodologies and impact criteria for evaluating the Proposed Project's potential effects on the various environmental areas of analysis. In disclosing impacts, the EIS considers the Proposed Project's potential to result in significant adverse impacts on the environmental setting. It is anticipated that the Proposed Project would be operational in 2029. Consequently, the environmental setting is not the current environment, but the future environment. Therefore, the technical analyses and consideration of alternatives first assess existing conditions and then forecast these conditions to 2029 ("Future Without the Proposed Project") for the purposes of determining potential impacts in the future with the Proposed Project ("Probable Impacts of the Proposed Actions").

FUTURE CONDITION WITHOUT THE PROPOSED ACTIONS (NO-ACTION)

For the purposes of the EIS, it is assumed that in the future without the Proposed Project (the "No Action" condition), the Development Site will continue in active use as in the existing condition. For each technical analysis in the EIS, the No Action condition will also incorporate approved or planned development projects within the appropriate study area that are likely to be completed by the analysis year. One of these projects, mentioned above, is the "Second Farms" proposal. The site of this project is within the modified existing LSRD that would be created as part of the Proposed Actions associated with the Lambert Houses Redevelopment. The Second Farms proposal would require further modification of the LSRD that will include Parcels 6, 7, 8a, 8b, and 9 of the Bronx Park South URA. Along with several other proposed actions, this would allow a new development of affordable housing, retail use, and community facility space at 1932 Bryant Avenue (Parcel 9 of the LSRD). If the 1932 Bryant Avenue project is not approved, there would be no effect on the Lambert Houses Redevelopment, which would proceed as proposed within a new LSRD.

FUTURE CONDITION WITH THE PROPOSED ACTIONS (WITH-ACTION)

In the future with the Proposed Actions (the "With Action" condition), the existing Lambert Houses buildings would be demolished and redeveloped with approximately 1,665 new affordable residential units, approximately 61,100 sf of retail space, and a new elementary school of up to approximately 86,608 sf. For each of the technical areas of analysis identified in the *2014 CEQR Technical Manual*, conditions with the Proposed Project will be compared to the No Action condition. The FEIS analyzes the following increment (see **Table 4**): an additional 934 residential units, an additional 21,610 sf of retail space, an 86,608 sf school, and a reduction of 265 parking spaces.

Table 4
Proposed Project – Incremental Development

	Residential (units)		Retail (sf)		Community Facility (sf)[1,2]		Parking (spaces)	
Parcel	Proposed	Increment	Proposed	Increment	Proposed	Increment	Proposed	Increment
1	494	257	10,500	10,500	2,250	2,250	35	35
3	737	412	6,000	6,000	0	-2,250	25	25
5	301	132	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	133	133	44,568	5,078	86,608	86,608	50	-325
Total	**1,665**	**934**	**61,100**	**21,610**	**88,858**	**86,608**	**110**	**-265**

Notes: 1. The existing early education facility on Parcel 3 would be relocated to Parcel 1.
2. An approximately 86,608-sf school would be constructed on Parcel 10.
Source: Phipps Houses

D. PROBABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTIONS

The Proposed Actions have the potential to result in significant adverse impacts on community facilities and services (intermediate school capacity), shadows, and transportation (vehicular and pedestrian circulation). These impacts and measures proposed to mitigate them are discussed below. Summaries of the findings for other technical areas are also described below.

LAND USE, ZONING, AND PUBLIC POLICY

LAND USE

Approval of the Proposed Actions would facilitate the sequential demolition of the existing Lambert Houses buildings and the redevelopment of the Development Site with a combination of affordable housing, retail, and a possible school.

Overall, the Proposed Project would redevelop the Development Site with the following:

- A total of 1,665 residential units at the completion of the project, for an increment of 934 units over the No Action condition (i.e., the existing Lambert Houses buildings). The proposed residential units would all be affordable.
- Approximately 61,100 sf of retail, for an increment of 21,610 sf over the No Action condition.
- A new public school of approximately 86,608 sf on a portion of Parcel 10. It is expected that this school would be a 500-seat elementary school.
- A reduction in the amount of parking at the site, for a total of 110 spaces.

With the increment of 934 new residential units and 61,100 sf of new retail uses over the No Action condition, the Development Site population would increase by approximately 2,681 residents and 54 new workers. In addition, the potential new school facility would introduce up to 500 new elementary school students.

The Proposed Project would result in the addition of uses that are already present in the Development Site, which is currently underdeveloped relative to both the amount of floor area currently permitted by zoning and also the density of the surrounding neighborhood. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be compatible and consistent with existing land uses and density in the Development Site, and would not result in any significant adverse land use impacts.

ZONING

In order to facilitate the Proposed Project, HPD and the project sponsor are seeking approval of several zoning-related actions, described above. The modifications to the previously approved LSRD and associated special permits and authorizations, including waivers of height and setback requirements, are being requested in order to allow for the redistribution of floor area across the entire Development Site, creating a site plan and building layout and design different from what would be allowed as-of-right under the current LSRD and proposed zoning districts. The potential for these actions to result in significant adverse impacts is assessed in FEIS Chapter 8, "Urban Design and Visual Resources."

As discussed in detail in that chapter, the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse effects on the pedestrian experience of the area's urban design, but rather would be expected to create strong

streetwalls, which would enhance the pedestrian experience. Overall, the Proposed Project would not result in adverse impacts in the areas or urban design or visual resources. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse impacts related to zoning.

PUBLIC POLICY

The FEIS identifies three (3) public policies applicable to the Proposed Actions and the Proposed Project: The City's Waterfront Revitalization Program (WRP), the Bronx Park South Urban Renewal Plan, and *Housing New York: A Five-Borough, Ten-Year Plan*, the City's plan to build or preserve 200,000 affordable residential units. As described below, the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse impacts to these public policies.

A portion of the Development Site is located within the New York City Coastal Zone. In accordance with the City's Waterfront Revitalization Program (WRP) and the federal Coastal Zone Management (CZM) Act, the Proposed Project requires review for its consistency with the City's WRP policies. On February 19, 2016, the Department of City Planning's Waterfront Open Space Division, on behalf of the New York City Coastal Commission, found that the Proposed Actions (WRP #15-120) would not substantially hinder the achievement of any Waterfront Revitalization Program (WRP) policy. Since the Proposed Project requires a federal approval from HUD that is subject to review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), an assessment of the Proposed Actions' consistency with WRP policies on the Federal Consistency Assessment Form was also conducted. On February 29, 2016, the New York State Department of State (DOS) – Office of Planning and Development, stated that DOS has no objection to federal funding in support of the Proposed Project.

The Bronx Park South Urban Renewal Plan, which designated the Development Site parcels for residential uses, expired in 2005. The establishment of the new LSRD and the other requested zoning actions would facilitate the creation of a site plan and building layout and design different from what would be allowed as-of-right under the current LSRD and proposed zoning districts. The new LSRD would facilitate the project's creation of new affordable housing in the Development Site, which would be consistent with the original goal of the Bronx Park South Urban Renewal Plan. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not affect any public policy related to the Urban Renewal Area.

As noted above, a major public policy goal for the City is *Housing New York: A Five-Borough, Ten-Year Plan*, the City's plan to build or preserve 200,000 affordable residential units. The Proposed Project would help to achieve that goal by replacing 731 units of outdated and inefficient housing with 1,665 new affordable housing units (for an increment of 934 affordable housing units relative to the No Action condition). Therefore, the Proposed Project would support and advance the goals of this policy.

SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Based on 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, the Proposed Actions warranted an analysis of indirect residential displacement, which is summarized below. The Proposed Actions did not warrant a detailed analysis related to direct residential displacement, direct or indirect business displacement, or effects to specific industries.

INDIRECT RESIDENTIAL DISPLACEMENT

Household incomes are low in the study area, reflecting the high concentration of New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) developments and other low-income housing. The median household income in the study area was $22,402 in 2009-2013, which is less than half the median household income of New York City, and about 35 percent less than the Bronx-wide median.

Since 1999, the median household income in the study area has decreased by nearly 18 percent (in inflation-adjusted dollars), a greater decline than that seen in the Bronx and New York City as a whole. A breakdown of income distribution further illustrates the proportion of low-income households within the study area, particularly as compared to the rest of New York City. Fifty-four percent of households earn less than $25,000 per year, while nearly 77 percent earn less than $50,000 per year. As described above, the household income distribution in the study area reflects the substantial presence of public housing and other rent-protected affordable units, including Lambert Houses itself, as well as other rent-regulated developments, such as West Farms and Twin Peaks.

The Proposed Project would result in the construction of 1,665 new affordable housing units (934 new affordable housing units, as compared to the No Action condition). The maximum rent levels that could be achieved at these new affordable units represent household incomes that could exceed those currently seen in the study area. However, as described earlier, all of the proposed new units would be affordable; as a result, the rent paid by new tenants would not exceed 30 percent of their household income. Therefore, on average throughout the redeveloped Lambert Houses, the proposed new units would have rent levels that serve a population with incomes similar to those currently residing within the surrounding community.

Residents within the ½-mile socioeconomic study area have lower incomes than the Bronx- or City-wide medians, and the study area is characterized by a substantial affordable housing stock. All of the proposed new residential units would be affordable; it is expected that the new units constructed with the Proposed Project, as well as the new population those units would introduce to the study area, as a whole would generally be similar to the existing income profile of the surrounding neighborhood. Further, the study area currently contains a high concentration of rent-regulated units whose tenants are not vulnerable to indirect residential displacement. The residential population within the study area who currently occupy rent-protected affordable housing units would not be adversely affected by the introduction of new housing units.

Therefore, the Proposed Project is not expected to introduce or accelerate a trend of changing socioeconomic conditions or displace a population of renters living in units not protected by government regulations restricting rents. According to 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, further analysis is not warranted, and the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse impacts due to indirect residential displacement.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

The Proposed Project does not trigger the thresholds for an analysis of health care facilities or fire and police protection services, and no significant adverse impacts on these facilities would occur. The Proposed Project exceeded the threshold for an analysis of elementary and intermediate schools, high schools, libraries, and child care facilities, and a detailed analysis was undertaken for each of these areas.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The Proposed Project would result in 934 units over the No Action condition. These units could introduce approximately 364 elementary students, 149 intermediate school students, and 177 high school students to Sub-district 2/CSD 12.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

In the future with the Proposed Project, the total enrollment of Sub-district 2/CSD 12 would increase by 364 students to 8,696 (120.51 percent utilization). As the elementary school proposed on Parcel 10 would increase the capacity of the sub-district by 500 seats (to a total of 7,216 seats), the Proposed Project would decrease the utilization rate of the sub-district by 3.55 percent, and the deficit of seats would decrease from 1,616 seats under the No Action to 1,480 seats.

With the development of the proposed public elementary school on Parcel 10, the Proposed Project would introduce more new capacity than elementary school students. As a result, the Proposed Project would decrease the elementary school utilization rate by 3.55 percentage points (from 124.06 percent in the No Action condition to 120.51 percent with the Proposed Project) – see **Table 6**. Because the Proposed Actions would not increase elementary school utilization rate, the Proposed Project would not result in a significant adverse impact on elementary schools in the study area.

The FEIS analyzes an alternative (the "No School Alternative") which replaces the proposed school on parcel 10 with an additional 55 residential units. As described in Section E below and in FEIS Chapter 20, "Alternatives," the FEIS discloses the potential for significant adverse impacts to elementary schools under this alternative. Should the school not be constructed on Parcel 10, measures that would mitigate this impact are discussed below under Section F and FEIS Chapter 21, "Mitigation."

INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS

As shown in **Table 5** below, in the future with the Proposed Project, the total intermediate school enrollment of Sub-district 2/CSD 12 would increase by 149 students to 3,196 (171.76 percent utilization), resulting in a deficit of 1,335 seats. The intermediate school students introduced by the Proposed Project would increase utilization in Sub-district 2/CSD 12 by eight percentage points compared with the No Action condition (from 163.75 percent in the No Action Condition to 171.76 percent with the Proposed Project).

In the future with the Proposed Project, the sub-district would operate at approximately 171.76 percent utilization and the Proposed Project would result in an increase in the utilization rate of more than 5 percentage points. Therefore, the Proposed Project would result in a significant adverse impact on intermediate schools. Measures to mitigate this impact are discussed below under Section F and FEIS Chapter 21, "Mitigation."

HIGH SCHOOLS

As shown in **Table 5** below, in the future with the Proposed Project, the total high school enrollment of the Bronx would increase by 177 students to 49,424 students. The new high school students introduced by the Proposed Project would increase utilization in the borough by 0.27 percent, less than one percent over the No Action condition, to 75.47 percent utilization. DOE does not require high school students to

attend a specific high school in their neighborhood; instead, they may attend any high school in the city depending on seating availability and admissions criteria. Utilization would remain under 100 percent. Further, the increase in the study area high school utilization rate would be less than one half of one percent, substantially lower than the 5 percent increase in utilization that, according to the 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual*, could be considered a significant adverse impact. Therefore, the implementation of the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts on high schools.

Table 5
Estimated Public School Enrollment, Capacity, and Utilization:
Future With the Proposed Project (With Proposed School)

Study Area	No Action Enrollment	Students Introduced by the Proposed Project	Total With Action Enrollment	Capacity	Available Seats	Utilization	Change in Utilization Compared with No Action
Elementary Schools							
Sub-district 2 of CSD 12	8,332	364	8,696	7,216	-1,480	120.51%	-3.55%
Intermediate Schools							
Sub-district 2 of CSD 12	3,047	149	3,196	1,861	-1,335	171.76%	8.01%
High Schools							
Bronx Borough	49,247	177	49,424	65,490	16,066	75.47%	0.27%

Sources: DOE *Enrollment Projections (Projected 2015-2024) by the Grier Partnership*; DOE, *Utilization Profiles: Enrollment/Capacity/Utilization, 2014-2015*, DOE *2015-2019 Proposed Five-Year Capital Plan*, Amended March 2016; School Construction Authority.

LIBRARIES

The Proposed Project would result in approximately 2,681 new residents, based on the average household size of 2.87. With this additional population, the West Farms Library would serve 77,628 residents (approximately a 3.58 percent increase). The holdings per resident ratio for the West Farms Library catchment area would decrease from 0.50 to 0.49 with the Proposed Project. For the West Farms Library, the catchment area population increases attributable to the Proposed Project are below the five percent threshold cited in the 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual*. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in a noticeable change in the delivery of library services. In addition, residents of the study area would have access to the entire NYPL system through the inter-library loan system and could have volumes delivered directly to their nearest library branch. Residents would also have access to libraries near their place of work. Therefore, the population introduced by the Proposed Project would not impair the delivery of library services in the study area, and the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse impacts on public libraries.

PUBLICLY FUNDED CHILD CARE

The Proposed Project is estimated to introduce approximately 934 affordable housing units by 2029. To provide a conservative analysis, it is assumed that all of these units would meet the financial and social eligibility criteria for publicly-funded child care. According to the current methodology for child care analyses in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, in general, the locations of publicly-funded group child care centers within 1½ miles of a project site should be shown, reflecting the fact that the centers closest to a given site are more likely to be subject to increased demand. However, the size of the study area in transit-rich areas may be somewhat larger than 1.5 miles. Therefore, since the Development Site is located in a transit rich area, the locations of publicly-funded group child care centers within 2 miles have been shown. Current enrollment data for the child care centers closest to the Development Site were gathered from ACS.

There are 55 publicly-funded child care facilities within the 2-mile study area. The child care and Head Start facilities have a total capacity of 4,369 slots and have 387 available slots (91.14 percent utilization).

Based on 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual* child care multipliers, the Proposed Project would result in approximately 130 children under the age of six who would be eligible for publicly-funded child care programs. With the addition of these children, child care facilities in the 2-mile study area would operate at 100.55 percent utilization with a deficit of 24 slots. Total enrollment in the study area would increase to 4,393 children, compared with a capacity of 4,369 slots, which represents an increase in the utilization rate of 2.98 percent over the future without the Proposed Project.

The *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines indicate that a demand for slots greater than the remaining capacity of child care facilities and an increase in demand of 5 percent of the study area capacity could result in a significant adverse impact. The increase with the Proposed Project would not exceed this 5 percentage point threshold; therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in a significant adverse impact on child care facilities.

It should be noted that several factors may reduce the number of children in need of publicly-funded child care slots in ACS-contracted child care facilities. Families in the study area could make use of alternatives to publicly-funded child care facilities. Parents of eligible children are also not restricted to enrolling their children in child care facilities in a specific geographical area and could use public child care centers outside of the study area.

OPEN SPACE

The Proposed Project would result in an incremental increase of approximately 934 residential units, resulting in an addition of 2,681 residents to the study area for a total residential population of 63,826. The FEIS examines the potential for the Proposed Project to have direct effects on nearby publicly accessible open spaces, such as eliminating or altering a public open space, as well as the potential for indirect effects created by changes in demand for and use of the area's open spaces. The analysis inventories the condition and use of open spaces within a ½-mile radius of the Development Site and addresses potential impacts on open space facilities both quantitatively and qualitatively. As described below, this analysis concludes that the Proposed Project would not result in any significant impacts on open spaces in the study area.

STUDY AREA OPEN SPACES

The Proposed Project would result in the decrease in size of the seating area south of Parcel 10. This open space would decrease from 0.10 acres to approximately 0.05 acres. Therefore, the study area would provide 32.72 acres of total open space, composed of 15.26 acres of active recreational open space and 17.46 acres of passive recreational open space.

OPEN SPACE - IMPACT SIGNIFICANCE

Direct Effects

The Proposed Project would reduce the size of the seating area located south of Parcel 10 from approximately 0.10 acres to approximately 0.05 acres. Although the open space would be slightly smaller in size, as compared to the future without the Proposed Project, the open space would be redesigned and substantially improved as part of the Proposed Project with additional seating and plantings. The potential

for the Proposed Project to result in shadows, air quality, and noise effects on any of the open spaces in the study area is discussed under "Shadows," "Air Quality," and "Noise," respectively.

River Park, adjacent to Parcels 1, 3 and 5 of the Development Site, would receive approximately six hours of new shadows in the mid-day and afternoons of the fall, winter and early spring, and the use of the park during these times could consequently be significantly impacted. In the late spring and summer, new shadows on River Park would be more limited in duration and extent but would still be substantial in the final hour of the analysis day and would cause significant adverse impacts in those seasons.

Indirect Effects

As noted above, the total, active, and passive open space ratios in the study area would continue to fall short of the City's guidelines in the future with the Proposed Project. The total open space ratio would decrease by 4.440 percent, the active open space ratio would decrease by 4.400 percent, and the passive open space ratio would decrease by 4.478 percent (to 0.495 acres, 0.239 acres, and 0.256 acres per 1,000 residents, respectively). Although the Proposed Project would result in a decrease in the total, active, and passive open space ratios from the future without the Proposed Project, these decreases would not exceed 5 percent, which is the CEQR threshold generally used for a more detailed open space analysis.

It is recognized that the City's guidelines are not feasible for many areas of the City, and they are not considered impact thresholds. The Proposed Project has plans to provide open spaces for building residents. The Proposed Project would include approximately 240,000 square feet of open space enclosed in courtyards surrounded by the proposed new buildings, which would be available to all building residents. The Development Site open spaces are expected to be landscaped with a mix of shrubs and trees; it is anticipated that lawn and seating areas would be provided as well as children's play equipment. One proposed new building on Parcel 10 would also provide approximately 12,655 square feet of open space for residents on its rooftop. In addition, each courtyard block would have an indoor fitness room for residents to use for active recreation. Therefore, these open space amenities would help meet some of the residents' open space needs.

In addition, some of the open space needs of the study area population would be met by open spaces located within and just outside the ½-mile study area boundary, including community gardens, Bronx Park, Crotona Park, and Starlight Park.

Overall, the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse indirect impacts on open space resources in the study area.

SHADOWS

Under 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, a shadows assessment is required if the Proposed Project would result in structures 50 feet or greater in height, or of any height if the project site is located adjacent to, or across the street from, a sunlight-sensitive resource. Sunlight-sensitive resources of concern include public open space, sunlight-dependent features of historic architectural resources, and natural resources that depend on sunlight. Since the Proposed Project would include new buildings taller than 50 feet, and since there are sunlight-sensitive resources adjacent to the Development Site, a detailed shadow study was conducted.

RESOURCES OF CONCERN INCLUDED IN THE SHADOWS ANALYSIS

Vidalia Park is bounded by East 179th and 180th Streets and Vyse and Daly Avenues (streets whose names combined give the park its name). This park offers both passive and active amenities, including play equipment, handball courts, and basketball courts in the northwest section, a large open lawn area in the center, benches and pathways. The Krystal Community Garden is located within the park on its east side along Vyse Avenue.

West Farms Square seating area is located at the northeast corner of the intersection of East Tremont Avenue and Boston Road. The plaza is paved throughout but contains several trees in pits. There is seating available on four benches, and a few large boulders. In the future No Action condition, this plaza would remain as it currently exists. However with the Proposed Project, it is anticipated that the proposed building footprint on Parcel 10 would extend onto the eastern and northern portions of the plaza, containing the boulders and most of the trees. This analysis conservatively assumes that the western portion of the plaza would continue to have seating amenities.

River Park is located in the southernmost portion of Bronx Park directly north and east across the street from the Development Site. It is a heavily used riverfront open space offering scenic views and walkways along the Bronx River, play equipment, seating, and barbecue areas.

West Farms Rapids Park is expected to be completed by 2029. Located along the Bronx River between East 180th Street and East Tremont Avenue, this segment of the greenway will provide approximately 1.40 acres, of which 0.98 acres are expected to be active and 0.42 acres are expected to be passive. The Bronx River (West Farms) Park will offer a greenway, plantings, seating, and a canoe launch.

River Garden is located directly east across the Bronx River from Parcel 5, on East 180th Street. This community garden offers passive recreational open space opportunities for locals to sit, garden, and barbeque.

Beck Memorial Presbyterian Church is located at 980 East 180th Street, adjacent to and west of Parcel 3. It has been determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Site visits in late 2015 and early 2016 found the structure to be boarded up with plywood and locked, and all its windows sheathed in metal. Additional research found that services are no longer held in the building; that the building has been boarded up and locked for at least four years; and that the windows were covered up because of the building's generally unsafe condition. No information is currently available regarding plans to re-open or make building repairs in the near future or by the 2029 build year for the project. Nevertheless, in order to ensure the most conservative analysis possible, the church was included in the analysis in the event that it re-opens in the future.

West Farms Soldiers Cemetery, also known as the Old West Farms Soldier Cemetery, is a New York City Landmark property and eligible for listing on the State and National Registers of Historic Places (S/NR). However, it is not publicly accessible. Further, there is nothing in the 1967 New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission designation report specifically identifying sunlight, the vegetation, trees, landscaping or any other sunlight-sensitive features as contributing factors to the property's historic significance. Therefore, for these reasons this property does not meet the definition of a sunlight-sensitive historic resource according to the *CEQR Technical Manual*. However, it was included in the shadow study for informational purposes since it is directly north and west of the Development Site.

The New Tabernacle Baptist Church, formerly the Swedish Evangelical Emmanuel Church and rectory at 992 East 181st Street, is not a City Landmark but is S/NR eligible. In terms of sunlight-sensitive features, the upper portion of the front (north) façade has a Tudor-arched stained-glass window with tracery. The east façade has several stained glass windows facing the Development Site. The west façade faces away from the project and its stained glass windows would not be affected by any project-generated shadow.

A portion of the Bronx River is located within the shadow study area and is mapped by New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) as a class B stream, which indicates its best usage for swimming and other contact recreation, but not for drinking water. The Bronx River flows approximately 24 miles through Westchester and Bronx Counties until it empties into the East River.

SHADOWS ANALYSIS RESULTS

The FEIS concluded that the Proposed Project could potentially result in significant adverse shadow impacts on two of the resources identified above: River Park and the Beck Memorial Presbyterian Church. No significant adverse shadow impacts are expected to occur on any other resources of concern identified above. As discussed below under Section F, "Mitigation," no measures to mitigate these impacts were identified between publication of the DEIS and FEIS, and the impacts would remain unmitigated.

RIVER PARK

In December, incremental shadows would be small at the start of the analysis day, and would grow larger over the course of the morning, falling across roughly the southwestern quarter by 11:00 AM. However, three-quarters of the park would still be in sun, including all the playground areas. There would be large areas of incremental shadow from around noon until the end of the analysis day at 2:53 PM. However, there would continue to be areas of sun in the northern part of the park. Since December does not fall within the growing season in New York City, shadows on vegetation would not be a concern. Regarding impacts to users, it is likely that barbecuing activities, playground use and passive sitting, walking and river viewing, which together make up all the uses within this park, would be quite light in the winter. Of these uses, the playground area is probably the most likely to see use in the winter on days when the weather is not too cold, and the playground area in the northern part of the park and would continue to receive sunlight for most of the analysis day. However, overall, large areas of the park would be in shadow, mostly project-generated, particularly during the afternoon, and on sunny winter days this could significantly impact users' experience in the park, both visually and in terms of warmth.

On the March 21 and September 21 analysis day, the park would continue to be in sun throughout the morning and mid-day. By 2:00 PM the southern fourth or fifth would be in incremental shadow, covering a portion of the lawn area with picnic tables used for barbequing, but the remaining three-quarters to four-fifths of the park would be in sun, including some of the picnic areas in the south. Only for the final hour or so of the analysis day, from 3:30 PM to 4:29 PM, would large areas of the park be in shadow, mostly incremental. All areas of the park, even in the southwest corner, would continue to receive a minimum of four hours of direct sunlight, and most areas would get substantially more, so that all vegetation would continue to receive adequate direct sunlight. However, in the early spring and the fall, park users, particularly those engaged in passive activities like sitting or barbequing, tend to take advantage of the sun for warmth on cooler afternoons. Therefore, the long duration of new shadows and the large extent of new shadows over the final hour or so of the afternoon would likely cause significant adverse impacts to users' experience in the park at these times.

In the late spring and summer analysis days, all the areas of the park would continue to receive a minimum of four to six hours of direct sunlight, and most of the park would receive substantially more. Shadows from Parcel 1 to the west would only begin to shade the park toward the late afternoon. Even at 4:00 PM (5:00 PM Daylight Saving Time) on both the May 6/August 6 and June 21 analysis days, more than half the park would remain in sun, including the picnic and barbequing areas. However, in the final hour of the late spring and summer days large areas of the park would be in shadow, much of it cast by the Proposed Project, causing significant adverse impacts to users' experience during those times.

BECK MEMORIAL PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

The east façade windows of the church would receive between two and a quarter and four and a half hours of incremental shadow in the mornings, depending on the season. At times, the new shadow would eliminate the remaining sunlight from the east windows of the church. Therefore, given the substantial extent and duration of incremental shadows, the Proposed Project could cause significant adverse shadow impacts to the windows, if they are uncovered by shutters and viewable from within a public space in the church interior. As noted above, no information is currently available regarding plans to re-open the church or make building repairs in the near future or by the 2029 build year for the Proposed Project.

DISCLOSURE OF NEW SHADOWS ON THE BRONX ZOO

New shadow would also reach a small portion of the Bronx Zoo within Bronx Park. This area is walled/fenced and not accessible to the public unless an entrance fee is paid. Therefore, per 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines the zoo is not a resource of concern for analysis. However, any new shadows falling on portions of the zoo is qualitatively disclosed and assessed below.

In the winter, some new shadows from the proposed redevelopment on the northern part of Parcel 1 would pass across the adjacent portion of the zoo to the north across Bronx Park South from about 10:00 AM until the end of the analysis day. The new shadow would move across landscaped/wooded areas adjacent to Bronx Park South, and the mostly paved Asia Plaza, Shuttle Station East and Asia Parking areas. It would not reach the African Plains enclosure nor the Jungle World building. The extent of incremental shadow would be small, relative to the extent of these areas.

In the early spring and the fall, shadows are shorter but extend further to the west at the start of the day and east and the end of the day. New shadows would, similar to the winter analysis day, pass across landscaped/wooded areas of the zoo adjacent to Bronx Park South and the Asia Gate, and in the late afternoon pass across a portion of the Jungle World building, which is an interior exhibit.

In the late spring and summer, when shadows are shortest and extend furthest southwest and southeast, new shadows would not reach the area of the zoo to the north across Bronx Park South. In the late afternoon new shadow would fall to the east on the mostly paved/structured area between the Jungle World building and River Park.

DISCLOSURE OF NEW SHADOWS ON PROJECT-GENERATED OPEN SPACE

The Proposed Project would include new open space. Per 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, project-generated open space cannot experience a significant adverse impact, because without the project the open space would not exist. However, the project-generated open space is included in the qualitative

analysis in FEIS Chapter 5, "Open Space," and therefore a qualitative discussion of how shadows might affect them is included below.

On Parcels 1, 3 and 5, new open space would be enclosed in courtyards surrounded by the proposed new buildings, which would be available to all building residents. The Development Site open spaces are expected to be landscaped with a mix of shrubs and trees; it is anticipated that lawn and seating areas would be provided as well as children's play equipment. One proposed new building on Parcel 10 would also provide approximately 12,655 square feet of open space for residents on its rooftop.

In the winter, the project open spaces On Parcels 1, 3 and 10 would be largely in shadow for most of the day, although small pockets of sun would fall here and there at times. On Parcel 5, the open space would be partially in sun and partially in shade throughout the day, because the space would be less enclosed to the south than the spaces on the other two parcels.

In the spring and fall, the spaces would be partially in sun and partially in shade over the course of the day. The shadiest space overall would be the one in the southern half of Parcel 1. The sunniest would be the Parcel 5 space which would be more than half in sun throughout the day until late afternoon.

In the summer all the project open spaces would be mostly in sun throughout much of the day.

HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

In the case of the Proposed Actions, which involve federal approvals, both NEPA and SEQRA require the consideration of potential impacts to historic resources. In addition, potential effects on historic resources are considered in conformance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and the New York State Historic Preservation Act of 1980 (SHPA). In addition, the New York City Landmark Law and potential impacts to New York City Landmarks (NYCLs) and New York City Historic Districts (NYCHDs) have been considered.

A public hearing on the DEIS was held on August 10, 2016, concurrently with the Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP) public hearing held by the New York City Planning Commission (CPC) at Spector Hall, 22 Reade Street, New York, NY 10007. Oral and written comments were accepted at the hearings and throughout the public comment period, which remained open until August 22, 2016. Since the proposal is subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the DEIS public hearing notice published on July 20, 2016 included a request for any individuals and/or organizations interested in participating as Section 106 Consulting Parties to indicate such interest at the public hearing or through written correspondence to the Lead Agency no later than August 22, 2016. No comments were received.

IDENTIFICATION OF THE AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECT

First, a study area or area of potential effect (APE) is defined based on the characteristics of the Proposed Action and the context in which it takes place. In general, potential effects on historic or architectural resources can include both direct physical effects (e.g., demolition, alteration, or damage from construction on nearby sites) and indirect, contextual effects, such as the isolation of a property from its surrounding environment, or the introduction of visual, audible, or atmospheric elements that are out of character with a property or that alter its setting.

The APE for archaeological resources is the area of planned construction and disturbance within the Development Site. In a comment letter dated August 29, 2014, LPC determined that the Development Site has no archaeological significance. The New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation (OPRHP), acting as the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) was also contacted for an evaluation of the APE's archaeological sensitivity, and the response letter dated March 17, 2016 identified no archaeological sensitivity. Based on potential effects due to on-site construction activities, and also to account for the project's potential visual and/or contextual impacts, the APE for architectural resources was defined as extending 400 feet from the Development Site.

EXISTING HISTORIC RESOURCES - DEVELOPMENT SITE

There are no known or potential architectural resources within the Development Site. In a comment letter dated August 29, 2014, LPC determined that the project area has no architectural significance. In a comment letter dated October 21, 2014, SHPO determined that the Lambert Houses development is not eligible for listing on the State or National Register (S/NR) owing to alterations to the buildings.

EXISTING HISTORIC RESOURCES WITHIN AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECT

Based on information received from both LPC and SHPO, the FEIS considers the following historic resources within the APE:

- Old West Farms Soldier Cemetery (S/NR-eligible, NYCL);
- Beck Memorial Presbyterian Church (S/NR-eligible, NYCL-eligible);
- New Tabernacle Baptist Church (S/NR-eligible);
- Peabody Home for Aged and Indigent Women (S/NR-eligible, NYCL-eligible);
- Former Bronx Consumers Ice Company (S/NR-eligible according to SHPO only);
- U.S. Post Office – West Farms Station (S/NR-eligible); and
- 182nd Street Dam, Bronx River (S/NR-eligible)

HISTORIC RESOURCES - PROBABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Direct Impacts

Using the *CEQR Technical Manual* direct impact criteria noted above, the proposed development within the Development Site would not result in the replication of aspects of any of the architectural resources in the study area so as to cause a false historical appearance, or the introduction of significant new shadows or significant lengthening of the duration of existing shadows over historic landscapes or structures. As described in FEIS Chapter 6, "Shadows," the Proposed Project would result in both incremental and reduced shadows on the West Farms Soldier Cemetery and the New Tabernacle Baptist Church, but the incremental shadows were not determined to create a significant adverse effect on these resources. There would be no physical changes to any of the architectural resources identified above.

There are four historic resources located within 90 feet of the Development Site, and thus would be within the area of potential construction-related project impacts:

- West Farms Soldier Cemetery. The cemetery is located within 90 feet of proposed buildings 1B and 1D on Parcel 1.

- New Tabernacle Baptist Church. The New Tabernacle Church is located within 90 feet of proposed building 1B on Parcel 1.
- Beck Memorial Presbyterian Church. The Beck Memorial Presbyterian Church is located within 90 feet of building 3A on Parcel 3.
- The former Peabody Home for Aged and Indigent Women. This resource is located within 90 feet of the Lambert Houses open space that would be located on Parcel 5.

Therefore, to avoid inadvertent demolition and/or construction-related damage to these resources from ground-borne construction-period vibrations, falling debris, collapse, etc., these buildings would be included in a CPP for historic structures that would be prepared in coordination with SHPO and LPC and implemented in consultation with a licensed professional engineer. The CPP would be prepared as set forth in Section 523 of the *CEQR Technical Manual* and in compliance with the procedures included in the DOB's TPPN #10/88 and LPC's *Guidelines for Construction Adjacent to a Historic Landmark* and *Protection Programs for Landmark Buildings*. Provisions of the 2014 New York City Building Code also provide protection measures for all properties against accidental damage from adjacent construction by requiring that all buildings, lots, and service facilities adjacent to foundation and earthwork areas be protected and supported. Further, Building Code Chapter 3309.4.4 requires that "historic structures that are contiguous to or within a lateral distance of 90 feet…from the edge of the lot where an excavation is occurring" be monitored during the course of excavation work. The CPP would be prepared and implemented prior to demolition and construction activities on the development site and project-related demolition and construction activities would be monitored as specified in the CPP. With these measures included as part of the Proposed Project, no significant adverse impacts related to historic resources would result.

Indirect Impacts

The Proposed Project would not isolate any architectural resource from its setting or visual relationship with the streetscape, or otherwise adversely alter a historic property's setting or visual prominence. The proposed buildings would be of a comparable height to the existing taller buildings in the surrounding area, and of a comparable footprint to the structures currently located within the Development Site itself. The proposed new buildings within the project area would not introduce incompatible visual, audible, or atmospheric elements to a resource's setting. The proposed residential, retail, and school uses of the development are comparable with the use of many of the historic buildings in the study area. The Proposed Project would not eliminate or screen significant publicly accessible views of any architectural resource.

As described in more detail in Chapter 6, "Shadows," the east façade windows of the Beck Memorial Presbyterian Church (S/NR-eligible, NYCL-eligible), adjacent to Parcel 3, would receive between two and a quarter and four and a half hours of incremental shadow from the proposed project in the mornings, depending on the season. At times, the new shadow would eliminate the remaining sunlight from the east windows of the church. Therefore, given the substantial extent and duration of incremental shadows, the proposed project could cause significant adverse shadows-related impacts to this historic resource, if the windows are uncovered by shutters and viewable from within a public space in the church interior. The building is currently closed and no information is currently available regarding plans to re-open the church or make building repairs in the near future or by the 2029 build year for the proposed project. Therefore, since no mitigation measures can be identified at this time to address the potential shadows impact on the church, the impact would remain unmitigated.

In summary, with the potential exception of the incremental shadow on the Beck Memorial Presbyterian Church, the Proposed Project would not be anticipated to have any significant adverse impacts on historic and cultural resources with the preparation and implementation of a CPP for architectural resources located within 90 feet of the Development Site. The project sponsor is also undertaking continuing consultation with OPRHP pursuant to Section 106 and Section 14.09.

URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES

The Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse impacts related to urban design and visual resources. The new buildings within the Development Site would be built with more rectilinear footprints and closer to the lot lines of the site than the existing buildings, and thus would create cohesive street frontages and stronger streetwalls throughout the Development Site. These stronger streetwalls would be expected to enhance the pedestrian experience along adjacent sidewalks. The Proposed Project would not result in any changes to buildings, natural features, open spaces, or streets in the study area. The Proposed Project would notably alter the visual character of the study area, but this character is already changing through the buildings currently under construction and renovation in the No-Action condition. At built FARs of 1.27-4.17, the density of the new development within the Development Site would not be out of scale compared to the surrounding area. The lower portions of the proposed buildings would be consistent with some of the shorter apartment buildings in the surrounding area, and the taller portions of the proposed buildings would be most consistent with the NYCHA and West Farms Square towers. The Proposed Project would create improve the Development Site's open spaces, which would enhance the pedestrian experience in the surrounding area, and would reintroduce the street grid in areas where streets had been demapped.

The Proposed Project would not partially or totally block a view corridor or a natural or built visual resource. The addition of new, taller buildings within the Development Site would alter certain views in the surrounding area. The new buildings would change the immediate context of the Bronx Park, as well as nearby historic resources. This change to context would not result in any significant adverse impacts, as the buildings and park would continue to be visible from existing nearby vantage points.

NATURAL RESOURCES

The condition of groundwater, floodplains, wetlands, aquatic resources, terrestrial resources, and threatened, endangered, and special concern species within the Development Site and study area would remain generally unchanged in the future with the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project would include mixed-use redevelopment of residential/commercial lots that presently contain minimal natural resources other than small areas of manicured lawn with trees, ruderal vegetation, and disturbance-tolerant wildlife species that are ubiquitous in urban areas. Protective measures, including erosion and sediment control and stormwater BMPs, as well as landscaping and planting within the Development Site would preclude adverse impacts to natural resources and improve conditions within the Development Site post-construction. No significant adverse impacts related to natural resources would result from the Proposed Actions.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I ESA) was conducted by AKRF in June 2015, which included a reconnaissance of the Development Site parcels and the surrounding area and review of a variety of information sources, including recent and historical Sanborn fire insurance maps,

environmental regulatory agency databases identifying state and federally listed sites, review of a 2013 Phase I ESA, also completed by AKRF, and geotechnical data compiled during the initial development of the Development Site in the 1970s. As discussed in the FEIS, the Phase I ESA identified several recognized environmental conditions (RECs), i.e., indicating the presence or likely presence of hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or at a Development Site. Former uses within (and near) the Development Site may have impacted subsurface conditions; and the existing residential and/or former commercial spaces may have used and stored oil for heating purposes and the existing structures proposed for demolition may contain ACM, LBP, and/or PCB-containing materials. Demolition of the existing structures and excavation activities associated with new construction could disturb these hazardous materials and potentially increase pathways for human or environmental exposure.

In connection with the proposed zoning changes, an (E) designation [E-393] would be assigned to all parcels of the Development Site to ensure that remedial activities would be undertaken prior to redevelopment. The (E) designation would ensure that appropriate procedures for any necessary subsurface disturbance are followed prior to, during, and following construction. The (E) designation constitutes an institutional control to require these measures on the privately owned parcels. Phase II investigations would be conducted in accordance with Sampling Protocols that would be pre-approved by New York City Mayor's Office of Environmental Remediation (OER). Based on the results of these investigations, Remedial Action Plans (RAPs) and associated Construction Health and Safety Plans (CHASPs) would be developed and submitted for approval to OER for implementation during the subsurface disturbance associated with construction, to reduce the potential for human or environmental exposure to any identified (by Phase II Investigations) or unexpectedly encountered contamination during and following construction of the Proposed Project.

The text of the (E) designation [E-393] for Block 3138, Lot 1; Block 3140, Lot 7; Block 3139, Lots 1 and 19; and Block 3132, Lot 1 would be as follows:

TASK 1: SAMPLING PROTOCOL

- **Prior to construction, the Applicant submits to OER, for review and approval, a Phase II Investigation protocol, including a description of methods and a site map with all sampling locations clearly and precisely represented.**
- **No sampling should begin until written approval of a protocol is received from OER. The number and location of sample sites should be selected to adequately characterize the site, the specific source of suspected contamination (i.e., petroleum-based contamination and non-petroleum-based contamination), and the remainder of the site's condition. The characterization should be complete enough to determine what remediation strategy (if any) is necessary after review of the sampling data. Guidelines and criteria for selecting sampling locations and collecting samples are provided by OER upon request.**

TASK 2: REMEDIATION DETERMINATION AND PROTOCOL

- **A written report with findings and a summary of the data must be submitted to OER after completion of the testing phase and laboratory analysis for review and approval. After receiving such results, a determination is made by OER if the results indicate that remediation**

is necessary. If OER determines that no remediation is necessary, written notice shall be given by OER.

- **If remediation is indicated from the test results, a proposed remedial action plan (RAP) must be submitted to OER for review and approval. The Applicant must complete such remediation as determined necessary by OER. The Applicant should then provide proper documentation that the work has been satisfactorily completed.**
- **A OER-approved construction health and safety plan (CHASP) would be implemented during evacuation and construction and activities to protect workers and the community from potentially significant adverse impacts associated with contaminated soil and/or groundwater. This plan would be submitted to OER for review and approval prior to implementation.**

With these measures, enforced through the (E) designation program, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials.

WATER AND SEWER INFRASTRUCTURE

Following the guidelines of the 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual*, an analysis of the Proposed Project's potential impacts on the wastewater and stormwater conveyance and treatment system was performed. As detailed in the FEIS, the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts on water and sewer infrastructure.

CONVEYANCE SYSTEM - EXISTING CONDITIONS

The Development Site is located in a part of New York City served by a combined sewer system that collects both sanitary sewage and stormwater. In periods of dry weather, the combined sewers (sized to convey an amount of sanitary sewage that is based on density levels according to zoning regulations) located in the adjacent streets convey only sanitary sewage. The Development Site includes four parcels (Parcels 1, 3, 5, and 10 of the Bronx Park South Large Scale Plan): Parcels 1 and 3 are served by sewer lines running east along Bronx Park South, East 181st Street[3], East 180th Street, and East 179th Street, connecting to a sewer line running south along Boston Road. Parcels 5 and 10 are served by a sewer line running south along Bronx Street (a demapped street located to the east of the Parcels) and west along Tremont Avenue, where it connects to the Boston Road sewer. The Boston Road sewer then runs south where it connects with Regulator CSO28, located on West Farms Road. Regulators are structures that control the flow of sewage to interceptors, i.e., larger sewers that connect the combined sewer system to the City's sewage treatment system. From Regulator CSO28, flow is conveyed to an interceptor that runs south to the Hunts Point Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP), one of the City's 14 WWTPs.

At the Hunts Point WWTP, wastewater is fully treated by physical and biological processes before it is discharged into the East River. The quality of the treated wastewater (effluent) is regulated by a State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (SPDES) permit issued by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC), which establishes limits for effluent parameters (i.e., suspended solids, fecal coliform bacteria, and other pollutants). Since the volume of flow to a WWTP affects the level of treatment a plant can provide, the maximum permitted capacity for the Hunts Point WWTP is 200

[3] A portion of East 181st Street extending through Parcel 1 is demapped, and the sewer line runs underneath the parcel; the City has an easement at this location.

million gallons per day (mgd). The average monthly flow to the WWTP over the past 12 months is 120 mgd,[4] which is well below the maximum permitted capacity.

During and immediately after wet weather, combined sewers can experience a much larger flow due to stormwater runoff collection. To control flooding at the Hunts Point WWTP, the regulators built into the system allow only approximately two times the amount of design dry weather flow into the interceptors. The interceptor then takes the allowable flow to the WWTP, while the excess flow is discharged to the nearest waterbody as combined sewer overflow (CSO). The Development Site is located within one CSO drainage area: in wet weather, sanitary flow and stormwater runoff is conveyed to CSO outfall HP-004, located immediately to the north of the Cross Bronx Expressway, where it is discharged into the Bronx River.

CONVEYANCE SYSTEM – WITH-ACTION CONDITION

The Proposed Project would not alter the conveyance system serving the Development Site. The new buildings that would be developed on the Development Site's parcels would continue to be served by a combined sewer system with sewer lines running along Bronx Park South, East 181st Street, East 180th Street, Bronx Street, and Tremont Avenue, which all connect to a sewer line running south along Boston Road. From the Development Site, stormwater and wastewater would continue to be directed to Regulator CSO28 and the Hunts Point WWTP, and CSO would continue to be conveyed to outfall HP-004.

Since publication of the DEIS, the Applicants have continued to meet with DEP to review the conveyance system serving the Development Site and to determine the scope of the hydraulic analysis that will be undertaken to consider the Development Site's proposed zoning and the conveyance system's adequacy in meeting future projected flows with the Proposed Project. The Applicants will continue to meet with DEP and, based on the hydraulic analysis, DEP will identify the potential need for conveyance system upgrades that would ensure the conveyance system is adequately sized to accommodate wastewater flows from the Proposed Project.

WITH-ACTION WATER DEMAND

2014 *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines recommend a preliminary water analysis if a project would result in an exceptionally large demand of water (over one million gpd), or is located in an area that experiences low water pressure (i.e., in an area at the end of the water supply distribution system such as the Rockaway Peninsula or Coney Island). The Development Site is not located in an area that experiences low water pressure, and the Proposed Project would result in an incremental water demand of 457,779 gpd. While this would represent an increase in demand on the New York City water supply system, it does not meet the *2014 CEQR Technical Manual* threshold requiring a detailed analysis. Therefore, an analysis of water supply was not warranted since it is expected that there would be adequate water service to meet the incremental water demand and that there would be no significant adverse impacts on the City's water supply.

WITH-ACTION SANITARY FLOWS

As described above, the Development Site is located in a combined sewer area in the Bronx and the project would include 1,665 affordable residential units (an increase of 934 units from existing

[4] 12-month period through June 2015.

conditions), which exceeds the 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual* threshold of 400 units. Therefore, following the guidelines of the 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual*, an analysis of the Proposed Project's potential impacts on the wastewater and stormwater conveyance and treatments system was performed.

Existing and future water demand and sanitary sewage generation are calculated based on use rates set by the 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual.* The DEP Flow Volume Calculation Matrix is then used to calculate the overall combined sanitary sewage and stormwater runoff volume discharged to the combined sewer system for four rainfall volume scenarios with varying durations. The ability of the City's sewer infrastructure to handle the anticipated demand from the Proposed Project is assessed by estimating existing sewage generation rates, and then comparing these existing rates with the With-Action condition, per 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual* methodology.

The incremental sanitary sewage generated by the Proposed Project, as compared to the existing buildings in the Development Site, would be 278,278 gpd. This incremental increase in sewage generation would be approximately 0.23 percent of the average daily flow at the Hunts Point WWTP (120 mgd) and would not result in an exceedance of the plant's permitted capacity of 200 mgd. In addition, in accordance with the New York City Plumbing Code (Local Law 33 of 2007), the new buildings that would be constructed with the Proposed Project would be required to utilize low-flow plumbing fixtures, which would reduce sanitary flows to the plant. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in a significant adverse impact to the City's sanitary sewage conveyance and treatment system.

STORMWATER FLOWS

The Proposed Project would redevelop the Development Site's parcels with new buildings, which would generally be built with more rectilinear footprints and closer to the lot lines of the site than the existing buildings in order to create cohesive street frontages and stronger streetwalls throughout the Development Site. In addition, the Proposed Project would reopen several streets within the Development Site: on Parcel 1, East 181st Street would be extended between Bryant Avenue and Boston Road, and the portion of Bryant Avenue between East 181st Street and East 180th Street would be reopened. Similarly, the portion of Bryant Avenue between East 180th Street and East 179th Street, which runs through Parcel 3, would be reopened. Similar to the existing layout of the parcels, the area between the new buildings Parcels 1, 3, and 5 would contain interior courtyards.

The reconfiguration of the Development Site with the Proposed Project would alter the surface coverage of the Development Site's parcels. In particular, with the division of Parcel 1 into two blocks through the reopening of East 181st Street and the reorientation of the buildings on Parcel 5 to create frontages on Boston Road and East 180th Street, the Proposed Project would result in smaller building footprints. As a result, the amount of rooftop area would be reduced to 178,079 sf (4.09 acres). The undeveloped portions of the parcels would contain a similar mix of paved spaces (walkways and parking areas) and landscaped spaces as in the existing configuration of the parcels, and are assumed to contain 65 percent landscaped area and 35 percent paved area. The Proposed Project would result in an overall reduction of building rooftop area and an increase in both paved and landscaped areas, therefore the weighted runoff coefficient would decrease to 0.63 (from 0.70 in the existing condition).

The DEP Flow Volume Calculation Matrix was completed for the existing conditions and the Proposed Project (the With-Action condition). The calculations from the Flow Volume Calculation Matrix help to determine the change in wastewater flow volumes to the combined sewer system from existing to proposed conditions, and include four rainfall volume scenarios with varying durations.

As described in the FEIS in all rainfall volume scenarios flow to CSO outfall HP-004 would increase. The increase in flow is attributable to the increase in sanitary flow resulting from the increased residential, retail, and community facility development in the Development Site with the Proposed Project. Due to the reduction of rooftop area and increase in paved and landscaped areas, the Proposed Project would result in a slight reduction in fully impervious surface area.

Flow Volume Matrix calculations do not reflect the use of any sanitary and stormwater source control best management practices (BMPs) to reduce sanitary flow and stormwater runoff volumes to the combined sewer system. As noted above, the Proposed Project would incorporate low-flow plumbing fixtures to reduce sanitary flow in accordance with the New York City Plumbing Code. The buildings would also meet HPD's Enterprise Green Communities criteria, which mandate water conservation.

In addition, stormwater BMPs would be required as part of the DEP site connection approval process in order to bring the new buildings into compliance with the required stormwater release rate. Specific BMP methods will be determined with further refinement of the buildings' design and in consultation with DEP, but may include on-site detention systems such as planted rooftop spaces ("green roofs") and/or vaults.

As discussed above, since publication of the DEIS, the Applicants have continued to meet with DEP to review the conveyance system serving the Development Site and to determine the scope of the hydraulic analysis that will be undertaken to consider the Development Site's proposed zoning and the conveyance system's adequacy in meeting future projected flows with the Proposed Project. The Applicants will continue to meet with DEP and, based on the hydraulic analysis, DEP will identify the potential need for conveyance system upgrades that would ensure the conveyance system is adequately sized to accommodate wastewater flows from the Proposed Project. Overall, with the incorporation of the appropriate DEP reviewed and approved sanitary flow and stormwater source control BMPs that would be required as part of the site connection approval process, the volume of stormwater runoff as well as the peak stormwater runoff rate from the Development Site would be reduced. Treatment capacity at the Hunts Point WWTP is sufficient to handle wastewater flow resulting from the Proposed Project. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts on sanitary wastewater treatment or stormwater conveyance infrastructure.

SOLID WASTE

Although the September 18, 2015 EAS concluded that no further analysis was required for this technical area, which was therefore not included in the DEIS or FEIS, a summary of the conclusions from the EAS can be found below.

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a solid waste and sanitation services assessment determines whether a project has the potential to cause a substantial increase in solid waste production that may overburden available waste management capacity or otherwise be inconsistent with the City's Solid Waste Management Plan (SWMP) or with state policy related to the City's integrated solid waste management system. Few projects have the potential to generate substantial amounts of solid waste (50 tons per week or more) that could result in a significant adverse impact. However, it is recommended in the *CEQR Technical Manual* that the solid waste and sanitation services demand generated by a project be disclosed, based on standard waste generation rates. Based on Citywide solid waste generation rates identified in Table 14-1 of the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the Proposed Project could generate approximately 24 tons per week of solid waste. This would not be considered a substantial amount of solid waste that would overburden available waste management capacity, and the Proposed Project would

not be inconsistent with the City's SWMP. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse impacts to solid waste and sanitation services and no further analysis is required.

ENERGY

Although the September 18, 2015 EAS concluded that no further analysis was required for this technical area, which was therefore not included in the DEIS or FEIS, a summary of the conclusions from the EAS can be found below.

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, because all new structures requiring heating and cooling are subject to the New York State Energy Conservation Code, which reflects State and City energy policy, actions resulting in new construction would not create significant energy impacts, and as such would not require a detailed energy assessment. For CEQR purposes, energy impact analysis focuses on an action's consumption of energy. As noted in the EAS prepared for the Proposed Project, based on the rates presented in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the Proposed Project would result in an annual energy consumption of approximately 121.8 million BTUs. Compared with the approximately 327 trillion BTUs of energy consumed annually within Con Edison's New York City and Westchester County service area, this incremental increase would be considered a negligible increment. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse impacts to energy and no further analysis is required. Further, if the project would seek funding from HPD, the Proposed Project would be subject to the 2011 Enterprise Green Communities Criteria Certification.

TRANSPORTATION

TRAFFIC

Traffic conditions were evaluated at 16 intersections for the weekday AM, midday, and PM peak hours. In the 2029 With Action condition, there would be the potential for significant adverse impacts at seven intersections during the weekday AM peak hour, three intersections during the weekday midday peak hour, and five intersections during the PM peak hour. **Table 6** provides a summary of the impacted locations by lane group and analysis time period. Potential measures to mitigate the projected traffic impacts are described below under Section F, "Mitigation." All of the significant adverse traffic impacts—except potentially those identified for the East Tremont Avenue at Boston Road/West Farms Road, East Tremont Avenue at Devoe Avenue/East 177th Street, East 177th Street at Sheridan Expressway, East 178th Street at Boston Road, and East 180th Street at Boston Road intersections during various peak periods—could be fully mitigated with standard mitigation measures such as signal timing changes.

Table 6
Summary of Significant Adverse Traffic Impacts

Intersection		Weekday AM Peak Hour	Weekday Midday Peak Hour	Weekday PM Peak Hour
EB/WB Street	**NB/SB Street**			
East 180th Street	Boston Road	WB-LTR SB-LTR		WB-LTR SB-LTR
East 180th Street	Devoe Avenue	EB-TR		
East 178th Street	Boston Road	EB-LR		EB-LR
East Tremont Avenue	Daly Avenue	SB-LTR		
East Tremont Avenue	Boston Road/West Farms Road	WB-LTR NB-LTR (Boston Road) SB-DefL	WB-LTR NB-R (West Farms Road) NB-LTR (Boston Road) SB-LTR	WB-LTR NB-R (West Farms Road) NB-LTR (Boston Road) SB-DefL
East Tremont Avenue	Devoe Avenue/East 177th Street	NB-L	NB-L	NB-L
East 177th Street/Sheridan Expressway	Devoe Avenue/East 177th Street	SB-LT SB-R	SB-LT	EB-LTR SB-LT
Total Impacted Intersections/Lane Groups		**7/11**	**3/6**	**5/10**

Notes: L = Left Turn, T = Through, R = Right Turn, DefL = Defacto Left Turn, EB = Eastbound, WB = Westbound, NB = Northbound, SB = Southbound.

TRANSIT

The preliminary screening assessment included in the FEIS concluded that a detailed analysis of station elements at the West Farms Square/East Tremont Avenue subway station was warranted. Based on the results of the transit analyses, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse impacts on circulation and control area elements at the West Farms Square/East Tremont Avenue subway station.

PEDESTRIANS

Weekday peak period pedestrian conditions were evaluated at key area sidewalk, corner reservoir, and crosswalk locations. Based on the detailed assignment of pedestrian trips, 15 sidewalks, 8 corners, and 6 crosswalks were selected for detailed analysis for the weekday peak hours. Significant adverse impacts were identified for two crosswalks during at least one weekday peak hour: both the northern and southern segments of one of these crosswalks would be impacted during the weekday AM, midday, and PM peak hours, while the other crosswalk would only be impacted during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, as summarized in **Table 7** below.

Table 7
Summary of Significant Adverse Pedestrian Impacts

Intersection	Pedestrian Element	2029 With Action		
		Weekday AM Peak Hour	Weekday Midday Peak Hour	Weekday PM Peak Hour
East Tremont Avenue and Boston Road	North Crosswalk	X		X
	East Crosswalk (North Segment)	X	X	X
	East Crosswalk (South Segment)	X	X	X
Total Impacted Pedestrian Elements		**3**	**2**	**3**
Note: X = Impacted.				

Potential measures, including widening crosswalks, were identified to mitigate the projected pedestrian impacts, as described under Section F, "Mitigation."

VEHICULAR AND PEDESTRIAN SAFETY

Crash data for the study area intersections were obtained from the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) for the period between 2011 and 2014. During this period, a total of 143 reportable and non-reportable accidents, zero fatalities, 157 injuries, and 52 pedestrian/bicyclist-related accidents occurred at the study area intersections. A rolling total of accident data identifies two study area intersections as high accident locations in the 2011 to 2014 period; these are East Tremont Avenue at Boston Road/West Farms Road and East 180th Street at Boston Road. A summary of the identified high accident locations, prevailing trends, project-specific effects, and recommended safety measures is provided in **Table 8**.

Table 8
Summary of High Accident Locations

High Accident Intersections	Prevailing Trends	Peak Hour Project-Specific Effects	Recommended Safety Measures
East Tremont Avenue and Boston Road/West Farms Road	None	Incremental trips: 175 vehicles and 320 peds	Restriping faded crosswalks
East 180th Street and Boston Road	None	Incremental trips: 130 vehicles and 340 peds	Restriping faded crosswalks
Source: NYSDOT crash data; May 1, 2011 to April 30, 2014. Crash data for the intersection of East Tremont Avenue and Boston Road/West Farms Road provided by NYCDOT for the period from January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2014.			

In addition to the above recommended safety measures at the two high accident locations, the Bronx Vision Zero Pedestrian Safety Action Plan also identified priority corridors (including the East Tremont Avenue corridor in the study area) and intersections with the highest rates of pedestrian fatality and severe injury, and in combination with safety engineering improvement projects, community outreach and education, and police enforcement, seek to eventually eliminate pedestrian fatalities and severe injuries across all boroughs.

PARKING

The Proposed Project would displace 325 spaces from the existing 375-space Parcel 10 parking facility and would create 60 on-street parking spaces on the new private streets. The future parking supply on the

Development Site would total 110 parking spaces. Accounting for the reduction in parking spaces at Parcel 10, a credit applied to the Parcel 10 parking facility for the relocation of existing parking demand to other areas, the creation of on-street parking spaces on private streets, and the incremental parking demand generated by the Proposed Project, the With Action public parking supply and utilization analysis shows that there would be parking shortfall during the weekday midday and overnight periods within the ¼-mile parking study area. However, based on the magnitude of available and total parking spaces within ½-mile of the project site (minimum of 670 out of more than 5,000 spaces), it is anticipated that the excess demand could be accommodated with a slightly longer walking distance beyond the ¼-mile radius. Furthermore, the Proposed Project is located immediately adjacent to multiple transit options, including the Nos. 2 and 5 trains, and multiple local bus routes (Bx9, Bx21, Bx26, Bx40, Bx42, and Q44). Therefore, the potential parking shortfall would not constitute a significant adverse parking impact.

AIR QUALITY

MOBILE SOURCES

With respect to mobile sources, the maximum projected hourly incremental traffic with the Proposed Project would exceed the 2014 *City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual* carbon monoxide (CO) screening threshold of 170 peak hour trips at one nearby intersection in the study area, and the fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$) emission screening threshold discussed in Chapter 17, Sections 210 and 311 of the *CEQR Technical Manual*. Therefore, a mobile source analysis for these pollutants was performed. The results indicated that the Proposed Project would not result in any violations of the 8-hour CO standard. In addition, the incremental increase in 8-hour average CO concentrations is very small, and consequently would not result in a violation of the *CEQR de minimis* CO criteria. Therefore, mobile source CO emissions from the Proposed Project would not result in a significant adverse impact on air quality.

STATIONARY SOURCES – HEATING AND HOT WATER SYSTEMS

An analysis was conducted to determine the maximum overall predicted concentrations for NO_2 and PM_{10} from the Proposed Project's heating and hot water systems, which were predicted to occur on elevated receptor locations on the Proposed Project's buildings. Maximum predicted concentrations on other existing buildings as well as at ground level receptors were much lower. The analysis showed that the maximum predicted pollutant concentrations, when added to ambient background levels, are below the NAAQS for each of the pollutant time averaging periods.

The air quality modeling analysis also determined the highest predicted increases in $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations. Maximum $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations were predicted at proposed Building 5A. The maximum 24-hour incremental concentration at any discrete receptor location would be less than the applicable *de minimis* criteria. On an annual basis, the maximum projected $PM_{2.5}$ increments would be less than the applicable *de minimis* criterion of 0.3 $\mu g/m^3$ for local impacts and 0.1 $\mu g/m^3$ for neighborhood scale impacts.

However, to ensure that there are no significant adverse impacts of $PM_{2.5}$ and 1-hour NO_2 from the Proposed Project's heating and hot water emissions, certain restrictions would be required through the mapping of an (E) designation for air quality [E-393] on each parcel. The air quality requirements of the [E-393] would be as follows:

AIR QUALITY (E) DESIGNATION [E-393] - BOILER FUEL RESTRICTION

- **Parcel 1 (Block 3138, Lot 1), Parcel 3 (Block 3132, Lot 1), Parcel 5 (Block 3140, Lot 7) and Parcel 10 (Block 3139, Lots 1 and 19)**

  Any new development on the above-referenced property must ensure that fossil fuel-fired heating and hot water equipment utilize only natural gas.

AIR QUALITY (E) DESIGNATION [E-393] – EXHAUST STACK LOCATION RESTRICTIONS (BY PARCEL)

PARCEL 1 (BLOCK 3138, LOT 1)

- **Building 1B**
  Any new development on the above-referenced property must ensure that heating and hot water equipment exhaust stack(s) are located at least 135 feet above grade, and located at least 144 feet away from any operable windows or air intakes on the tallest portion of the approved massing envelope for proposed Building 1A, and must be fitted with low NO_x burners with a maximum emission concentration of 41 ppm, to avoid any potential significant air quality impacts.
- **Building 1C and 1D**
  Any new development on the above-referenced property must ensure that heating and hot water equipment exhaust stack(s) are located at least 153 feet above grade, and must be fitted with low NO_x burners with a maximum emission concentration of 41 ppm, to avoid any potential significant air quality impacts.

PARCEL 3 (BLOCK 3132, LOT 1)

- **Buildings 3B and 3C**
  Any new development on the above-referenced property must ensure that heating and hot water equipment exhaust stack(s) are located at least 144 feet above grade, and located at least 200 feet away from any operable windows or air intakes on the tallest portion of the approved massing envelope for proposed Building 5A, and must be fitted with low NO_x burners with a maximum emission concentration of 41 ppm, to avoid any potential significant air quality impacts.

PARCEL 10 (BLOCK 3139, LOT 1)

- **School Building**
  Any new development on the above-referenced property must ensure that heating and hot water equipment exhaust stack(s) are located at least 62 feet above grade, and located at least 117 feet away from any operable windows or air intakes on the approved massing envelope for proposed Building 10A, and must be fitted with low NO_x burners with a maximum emission concentration of 41 ppm, to avoid any potential significant air quality impacts.

PARCEL 10 (BLOCK 3139, LOT 1)

- **Supermarket and Retail**
  Any new development on the above-referenced property must ensure that heating and hot water equipment exhaust stack(s) are located at least 150 feet away from any operable windows or air intakes on the approved massing envelope for proposed Building 10A, to avoid any potential significant air quality impacts.

With these measures, enforced through the (E) designation program, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse impacts related to stationary source air quality. To the extent permitted under Section 11-15 of the Zoning Resolution, the requirements of the (E) designations may be modified, or determined to be unnecessary, based on new information or technology, additional facts or updated standards that are relevant at the time each building is ultimately developed.

INDUSTRIAL SOURCES

To assess air quality impacts on the Proposed Project due to emissions from nearby industrial sources, an investigation was conducted. Initially, land use and Sanborn maps were reviewed to identify potential sources of emissions from manufacturing/industrial operations. A search of the DEP's Bureau of Environmental Compliance (BEC) air permits was performed to determine whether manufacturing or industrial emissions occur. In addition, a search of federal and state-permitted facilities within a 400-foot study area was conducted using the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Envirofacts database. A field survey was conducted to identify buildings within 400 feet of the Development Site that have the potential for emitting air pollutants. The survey was conducted on July 1, 2015.

A request was made to DEP-BEC to obtain the certificates of operation for identified locations of potential industrial source emissions, to determine whether manufacturing or industrial emissions occur. No businesses were found to have a DEP certificate of operation within the study area. Therefore, no analysis was required and no significant adverse impacts are anticipated.

ADDITIONAL SOURCES

The *CEQR Technical Manual* requires an analysis of projects that may result in a significant adverse impact due to certain types of new uses located near a "large" or "major" emissions source. Major sources are defined as those located at facilities that have a Title V or Prevention of Significant Deterioration air permit, while large sources are defined as those located at facilities that require a State Facility Permit.

To assess the potential effects of these types of existing sources on the Proposed Project, a review of existing permitted facilities was conducted. Within a 1,000-foot study area boundary (the distance referenced in the *CEQR Technical Manual*), sources permitted under the NYSDEC Title V and State Facility Permit programs were considered. One facility with a State Facility Permit was identified: the NYCT West Farms Bus Depot, located at 1100 East 177th Street, which is approximately 800 feet from the Development Site. According to the permit, the facility operates two 12.55 million Btu/hr boilers, each capable of burning natural gas or No. 2 fuel oil and three 800 horsepower (hp) natural gas-fired compressor engines. The boilers and the compressor engines are ducted to individual stacks. The facility also operates two diesel generators rated at 350 hp and 670 hp which operate as part of New York Power Authority's (NYPA) Peak Load Management program for demand response. The two generators are limited to 50 hours per year operation as part of the permit condition. The facility NO_x emissions are capped at 24.9 tons per year as per the State Facility Permit.

Potential stationary source impacts on the Development Site from the NYCT West Farms Bus Depot combustion sources were determined using the AERMOD model. The maximum predicted concentrations of NO_2, SO_2 and PM_{10} were added to the background concentrations to estimate total air quality concentrations on the Proposed Project, while $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations were compared with the $PM_{2.5}$ *de minimis* criteria. The results of this analysis showed that the predicted pollutant concentrations for all of the pollutant time averaging periods shown are below their respective standards. Therefore, no significant adverse air quality impacts on the Proposed Project from this source would occur.

POTENTIAL CUMULATIVE 1-HOUR NO_2 IMPACTS FROM THE NYCT WEST FARMS BUS DEPOT AND PROPOSED PROJECT

The potential cumulative impacts associated with emissions the Proposed Project's heating and hot water systems and the NYCT bus depot's emission sources were also evaluated. While the maximum modeled 1-hour NO_2 concentration from the NYCT bus depot, when added to background concentrations, was predicted to be 176.1 $\mu g/m^3$, compared with the NAAQS of 188 $\mu g/m^3$. The short-term impacts from the NYCT West Farms Bus Depot are based on the conservative assumption of one boiler operating at 100 percent load on No.2 fuel oil; however, recent fuel usage estimates provided by NYCT show that the boilers predominantly burn natural gas rather than No. 2 fuel oil. In addition, the stack exhaust locations for the NYCT boilers and compressor engines and the Proposed Project's heating and hot water system sources are substantially different. Consequently, on a 1-hour basis, since winds are assumed to be blowing in the same direction continuously, maximum NO_2 concentrations at project and off-site locations from the emission sources due to the bus depot and the Proposed Project would occur at different locations. Therefore, the potential for an exceedance of the 1-hour NO_2 NAAQS from the bus depot and the Proposed Project is considered to be unlikely, and no significant adverse impacts are predicted.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

The building energy use and vehicle use associated with the Proposed Project would result in up to approximately 16,500 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e) emissions per year.

The 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual* defines five goals through which a project's consistency with the City's emission reduction goal is evaluated: (1) efficient buildings; (2) clean power; (3) sustainable transportation; (4) construction operation emissions; and (5) building materials carbon intensity.

Phipps Houses is currently evaluating the specific energy efficiency measures and design elements that may be implemented, and is committed to meeting the requirements for certification under the Enterprise Green Communities program. All new construction and substantial rehabilitation projects receiving funding from HPD must comply with a 2011 version of the Enterprise Green Communities Criteria (EGCC), a green building framework for affordable housing tailored to New York City. Phipps Houses is committed at a minimum to achieve the mandatory EGCC energy efficiency requirements. The project would be required to exceed the energy requirements of ASHRAE 90.1-2007 by 15 percent, which is expected to also exceed the New York City building code (currently the same as ASHRAE 90.1-2010). The project's commitment to building energy efficiency, exceeding the building code energy requirements, ensures consistency with the efficient buildings goal defined in the 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual* as part of the City's GHG reduction goal.

The Proposed Project would also support the other GHG goals by virtue of its nature and location: its proximity to public transportation, its reliance on natural gas (rather than heating oil), commitment to construction air quality controls, and the fact that as a matter of course, construction in New York City uses recycled steel and includes cement replacements. All of these factors demonstrate that the Proposed Project supports the GHG reduction goal.

Therefore, based on the commitment to energy efficiency and by virtue of location and nature, the Proposed Project would be consistent with the City's emissions reduction goals, as defined in the 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual*, and would not result in significant adverse impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions.

NOISE

Existing noise levels at the Development Site were measured at six (6) locations (receptor sites). Site 1 was located on Bronx Park South between Boston Road and Bryant Avenue, Site 2 was located on 180th Street between Boston Road and Vyse Avenue, Site 3 was located on Boston Road between 179th Street and 180th Street, Site 4 was located on 179th Street between Boston Road and Vyse Avenue, Site 5 was located on Tremont Avenue between Boston Road and Devoe Avenue, and Site A was located on the roof of the parking garage at Boston Road and 179th Street. At all receptor sites, existing noise levels were measured for 20-minute periods during three weekday peak periods—AM (7:30 AM to 9:30 AM), midday (MD) (12:00 PM to 2:00 PM), and PM (4:30 PM to 6:30 PM). Measurements were taken on June 25, 2013.

The results of the existing noise level measurements are summarized in **Table 9**. At receptor sites 1 through 5, vehicular traffic was the dominant noise source. Measured levels are moderate to relatively high and reflect the level of vehicular activity on the adjacent roadways. At receptor site A, rail noise from the elevated MTA #2 and #5 trains was the dominant noise source. Measured levels were high to very high and reflect the level of rail activity on the elevated rail line. Vehicular traffic from adjacent streets was also included in the measurement but was not considered a dominant source. In terms of the CEQR criteria, the existing noise levels at receptor site 1 would be in the "marginally acceptable" category, existing levels at receptor sites 2, 3, 4, and 5 would be in the "marginally unacceptable" category, and existing levels at receptor site A would be in the "clearly unacceptable" category. In terms of the HUD criteria, the calculated L_{dn} noise levels at sites 1 through 5 would be in the "normally unacceptable" category, and the calculated L_{dn} noise levels at site A would be in the "unacceptable" category.

The *CEQR Technical Manual* has set noise attenuation quantities for buildings based on exterior $L_{10(1)}$ noise levels in order to maintain interior noise levels of 45 dBA or lower for residential uses and interior noise levels of 50 dBA or lower for commercial uses. In addition, **t**he *HUD Noise Guidebook* recommends that buildings should provide sufficient window/wall attenuation to result in L_{dn} values of 45

dBA or less for residential uses. The results of the building attenuation analysis are summarized in **Table 10**.

Table 9
Existing Noise Levels (in dBA)

Site	Measurement Location (Receptor Site)	Time	L_{eq}	L_1	L_{10}	L_{50}	L_{90}	L_{dn}
1	Bronx Park South between Boston Road and Bryant Avenue	AM	65.3	76.2	67.9	61.4	57.0	66.1
		MD	66.2	77.1	68.1	62.4	59.7	
		PM	63.8	73.5	66.5	61.0	58.1	
		LN	60.2	67.2	63.4	58.3	57.2	
2	180th Street between Boston Road and Vyse Avenue	AM	70.9	79.7	75.0	67.1	61.1	71.3
		MD	70.0	81.4	72.6	65.8	60.9	
		PM	69.2	79.3	72.0	64.8	60.8	
		LN	65.9	77.5	68.0	60.3	57.4	
3	Boston Road between 179th Street and 180th Street	AM	70.3	80.4	74.2	65.6	59.5	72.3
		MD	70.4	82.3	73.0	64.8	59.2	
		PM	69.9	80.2	73.0	64.8	60.5	
		LN	67.3	76.8	71.1	60.6	56.5	
4	179th Street between Boston Road and Vyse Avenue	AM	67.9	78.2	71.1	61.2	58.8	69.8
		MD	64.1	71.8	67.9	60.4	58.5	
		PM	64.4	73.2	68.5	60.8	59.1	
		LN	65.4	76.3	68.6	59.5	58.0	
5	Tremont Avenue between Boston Road and Devoe Avenue	AM	74.1	82.4	78.0	71.3	68.3	75.0
		MD	74.3	80.5	77.7	72.6	68.5	
		PM	74.9	82.3	78.5	72.7	67.9	
		LN	69.4	79.5	73.4	64.5	59.2	
A	Boston Road and 179th Street (Roof of Parking Garage)	AM	82.6	92.9	88.4	69.6	66.4	83.6
		MD	81.8	91.4	87.8	69.1	67.6	
		PM	81.0	91.8	86.0	68.5	67.0	
		LN	78.5	91.1	80.9	66.9	64.9	

Note: Measurements were conducted by AKRF Acoustics Department on June 25 and 26, 2013.

Table 10
Building Attenuation Requirements

Parcel #	Building	Facade	Measurement Location	Maximum Predicted L_{10} (in dBA)	CEQR Attenuation Required (in dBA)[1]	Maximum Calculated L_{dn} (in dBA)	HUD Attenuation Required (in dBA)[3]	Attenuation Required (in dBA)[4]
1	1A	All	1	68.1	N/A[2]	66.1	22	22
	1B	All	1	68.1	N/A[2]	66.1	22	22
	1C	All	1	68.1	N/A[2]	66.1	22	22
	1D	South, East	2	75.0	31	71.3	27	31
		North, West	3	74.2	31	72.3	28	31
3	3A	All	2	75.0	31	71.3	27	31
	3B	All	2	75.0	31	71.3	27	31
	3C	North, West	2	75.0	31	71.3	27	31
		East, South	3	74.2	31	72.3	28	31
	3D	East, North	3	74.2	31	72.3	28	31
		West, South	4	71.1	28	69.8	25	28
	3E	All	4	71.1	28	69.8	25	28
	3F	All	4	71.1	28	69.8	25	28
5	5A	West, South, East	3	74.2	31	72.3	28	31
		North	2	75.0	31	71.3	27	31
	5B	All	2	75.0	31	71.3	27	31
10	10A	North, West	A	88.4	45	83.6	39	45
		East, South	5	78.5	35	75.0	30	35
10	School	North, West	A	88.4	45	83.6	39	45
		East, South	5	78.5	35	75.0	30	35

Notes:
(1) The above composite window-wall attenuation values are for residential development. Commercial uses would be 5 dB(A) less.
(2) "N/A" indicates that the L_{10} value is less than 70 dB(A). The *CEQR Technical Manual* does not address noise levels this low, therefore there is no minimum attenuation guidance.
(3) The HUD attenuations apply to residential uses only.
(4) Window/wall attenuations required to satisfy both CEQR and HUD requirements, where applicable and conservative.

Based upon the measured $L_{10(1)}$ and calculated L_{dn} values at the Development Site, the Proposed Project's design measures would be expected to provide sufficient attenuation to achieve both the CEQR and the HUD interior noise level requirements.

In order to ensure that the proposed project would achieve the necessary building attenuation requirements, an (E) designation for noise [E-393] would be mapped on each parcel of the Development Site. The text of [E-393] for Block 3138, Lot 1; Block 3140, Lot 7; Block 3139, Lots 1 and 19; and Block 3132, Lot 1 is as follows:

> **In order to ensure an acceptable interior noise environment, future residential/classroom uses must provide a closed window condition in order to maintain an interior noise level of 45 dBA. Retail, commercial and administrative uses must provide a closed window condition in order to maintain an interior noise level of 50 dBA. In order to maintain a closed window condition, an alternate means of ventilation that brings outside air into the building must also be provided. Alternate means of ventilation includes, but is not limited to, central air conditioning, PTAC units with a user-operable air damper, etc. The specific attenuation requirements to be implemented throughout the proposed new buildings are provided in the Lambert Houses FEIS, Table 15-5 (CEQR No. 16HPD001X), September 2016, for each development site included in the Proposed Project.**

In addition, the building mechanical system (i.e., heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems) would be designed to meet all applicable noise regulations (i.e., Subchapter 5, §24-227 of the New York City Noise Control Code and the New York City Department of Buildings Code) and to avoid producing levels that would result in any significant increase in ambient noise levels.

With these measures, enforced through the (E) designation program, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse impacts related to noise.

PUBLIC HEALTH

Public health is the effort of society to protect and improve the health and well-being of its population. Many public health concerns are closely related to hazardous materials, water quality, air quality, and noise. The 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual* defines as its goal with respect to public health "to determine whether adverse impacts on public health may occur as a result of a project, and if so, to identify measures to mitigate such effects."

According to the 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual*, for most projects, a public health analysis is not necessary. Where no significant unmitigated adverse impact is found in other CEQR analysis areas, such as air quality, water quality, hazardous materials, or noise, no public health analysis is warranted. If, however, an unmitigated significant adverse impact is identified in one of these analysis areas, the lead agency may determine that a public health assessment is warranted for that specific technical area.

The Proposed Project would not result in unmitigated significant adverse impacts in any of the technical areas related to public health (hazardous materials, water quality, air quality, or noise) during either construction or operation of the project. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not have the potential for significant adverse impacts related to public health.

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

This chapter considers the effects of the Proposed Project on neighborhood character. According to the 2014 *City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual*, neighborhood character is an amalgam of various elements that give a neighborhood its distinct "personality." These elements may include a neighborhood's land use, socioeconomic conditions, open space, historic and cultural resources, urban design and visual resources, shadows, transportation, and noise. Not all of these elements affect neighborhood character in all cases; a neighborhood usually draws its distinctive character from a few defining elements.

Overall, the Proposed Project would not substantially alter the character of the neighborhood and would likely have beneficial effects on the study area's urban design. The character of the study area is primarily defined by multifamily residential buildings and neighborhood retail uses, with taller, larger-footprint buildings in the central portion of the study area and smaller walk-up buildings in the western portion. In addition, the elevated Nos. 2 and 5 trains, which run above Boston Road, and other transportation infrastructure contribute to the character of the neighborhood.

With the exception of transportation and shadows, the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts on any of the technical areas that could impact neighborhood character. As noted above, the potential shadows impact on the east façade windows of the Beck Memorial Presbyterian Church would not affect neighborhood character as the church is closed with no available plans to re-open the church or make building repairs. While the shadows impact on River Park could affect the use of the park at the affect times, overall, this impact would not affect neighborhood character of the Development Site. Mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce the effects of the significant adverse transportation impacts. While some of the significant adverse traffic impacts would not be fully mitigated, the unmitigated effects would not be substantial enough to adversely impact neighborhood character. As noted above, the thoroughfares and sidewalks in the neighborhood are already heavily trafficked. In addition, the Proposed Project would not be expected to result in a combination of moderate effects to several elements that could cumulatively impact neighborhood character. Overall, the Proposed Project would be consistent with the existing character of the neighborhood and would not result in any significant adverse impacts on neighborhood character.

CONSTRUCTION

There would be temporary inconvenience and disruption arising from the construction of the proposed Lambert Houses project throughout the Development Site. Construction is anticipated to begin in January 2017 and be complete in September 2029. During construction of the Proposed Project, current tenants would be relocated from buildings to be demolished to other locations within the Lambert Houses development. Once relocated, the unoccupied buildings would be demolished and construction of new buildings would proceed. Tenants of the next buildings to be demolished would be relocated within the Lambert Houses Development Site to the newly constructed buildings, and the demolition and new construction process would begin again. This process would be repeated through completion of the project.

As described in detail below, construction activities associated with the Proposed Project could result in significant adverse construction impacts with respect to vehicular traffic; additional information for key technical areas is summarized below.

CONSTRUCTION - TRANSPORTATION

Based on the construction trip projections and comparison with operational analysis results, construction of the Proposed Project is expected to result in significant adverse traffic impacts and the potential for a parking shortfall during peak construction, as summarized below. However, no significant adverse impacts to transit or pedestrian conditions are anticipated due to construction.

Construction Traffic

During peak construction, the project-generated trips would be less than what would be realized upon the full build-out of the Proposed Project in 2029. Therefore, the potential traffic impacts during peak construction would be within the envelope of significant adverse traffic impacts identified for the With Action condition. Measures to mitigate the operational traffic impacts were recommended for implementation at five intersections during one or more of the weekday analysis peak hours. These measures would encompass primarily signal timing changes and approach daylighting, all of which could be implemented early at the discretion of NYCDOT to address actual conditions experienced at that time. However, as with the With Action condition, there could also be significant adverse traffic impacts at the intersections of East Tremont Avenue and Boston Road/West Farms Road, East Tremont Avenue and Devoe Avenue/East 177th Street, East 177th Street and Sheridan Expressway, East 178th Street and Boston Road, and East 180th Street and Boston Road that could not be fully mitigated during one or more analysis peak hours.

Construction Parking

The anticipated construction activities are projected to generate a maximum parking demand of 134 spaces during peak construction. However, additional parking demand is expected to be generated from background growth, discrete No Build projects, and incremental parking demand generated by the re-tenanting of the Development Site parcels. Although the parking demand associated with construction workers commuting via auto would be temporary in nature, it can be expected that a parking shortfall may still occur within ¼-mile of the Development Site. However, as with the analysis results presented for the With Action operational condition, based on the proximity of multiple transit options to the Proposed Project, as well as that most of the excess demand is expected to be accommodated by parking facilities outside of the ¼-mile parking study area radius, the potential parking shortfall during construction would also not constitute a significant adverse parking impact.

Transit

The estimated number of total peak hour transit trips would be 67, well below the *CEQR Technical Manual* 200-transit-trip analysis threshold. Therefore, construction of the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse construction transit impacts, and no further analysis is required.

Pedestrians

The estimated number of total peak hour pedestrian trips traversing the area's sidewalks, corners, and crosswalks would be up to 191 during peak construction and below the *CEQR Technical Manual* 200-pedestrian-trip analysis threshold for detailed analysis. Therefore, construction of the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse pedestrian impacts, and no further analysis is required.

CONSTRUCTION - AIR QUALITY

The local air quality effects would be temporary and would only occur during the construction period. Furthermore, construction activities associated with the Proposed Project would move from one parcel to another such that no portion of the adjacent community would be subject to the full effects of the construction of the Proposed Project for the entire construction period. The air pollutant emission levels associated with construction of the Proposed Project would not be considered out of the ordinary in terms of intensity and are typical of ground-up building construction in New York City. Measures would be taken to reduce pollutant emissions during construction in accordance with all applicable laws, regulations, and building codes. In addition, there would be an increasing percentage of in-use newer and cleaner vehicles and engines for construction in future years, resulting in greatly reduced air pollutant emissions related to construction activities. Therefore, construction of the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse air quality impacts.

CONSTRUCTION - NOISE

Construction activities associated with the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse stationary or mobile source noise impacts. Construction of the Proposed Project would adhere to the requirements of the *New York City Noise Control Code*. While the overall construction period of the Proposed Project is anticipated to be approximately 13 years, on-site construction activities for each building group is expected to last approximately two years. The noisiest construction activities (demolition, excavation, and foundation work when dominant noise equipment such as hoe rams and pile drivers are used on the construction site) are anticipated to occur for only a portion of the duration—6 months per building group—and would not occur continuously throughout the demolition and foundation stages of work. Noise levels from construction activities typically fluctuate throughout the day and from day to day, and would not be sustained at the maximum noise levels during the entire 6 months of demolition, excavation, and foundation activities for each building group. Superstructure and exteriors work, which would be expected to last approximately 9 months per building group, would require less heavy construction equipment as compared to the demolition, excavation and foundation work.

With the construction noise control measures, maximum $L_{eq(1)}$ noise levels during construction would be expected to be approximately in the mid 80s dBA at 10 to 20 feet from the construction site boundary or the mid to high-70s dBA at 50 to 100 feet from the construction site boundary. These maximum noise levels would occur during the loudest periods of construction, which would be rock removal or pile driving where necessary. Noise levels resulting from construction activity were projected at receptors throughout the study area based on distance and shielding provided by existing buildings or project buildings already constructed. The magnitude of the noise levels predicted to occur at nearby buildings is generally comparable to measured existing noise levels at some locations in the neighborhood due to the elevated rail line that runs through the area. Furthermore, the duration of the elevated noise levels due to construction would be limited to a relatively short time, and/or most of the locations have double-glazed windows and through-wall air conditioners or window air conditioners. Consequently, there are only a limited number of locations that would experience noise levels above the threshold considered acceptable by CEQR noise exposure guidelines, and the exceedances would occur for a relatively short period of time. The predicted noise level increases at nearby receptors due to construction, while they would be noticeable, would not rise to the level of significant adverse construction noise impacts.

Receptors that are located more than 200 feet away from the construction sites with no obstructing buildings or more than 150 feet away with obstructing buildings, would experience construction noise levels no higher than the low 60s dBA, which is lower than the measured existing noise levels throughout

the study area. Consequently, receptors outside of these distances would not have the potential to experience significant adverse construction noise impacts.

CONSTRUCTION – OTHER TECHNICAL AREAS IMPACT ASSESSMENT

As described in the FEIS, the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse construction impacts on land use and neighborhood character, socioeconomic conditions, community facilities, open space, and natural resources. Measures included as part of the Proposed Project would preclude construction impacts related to historic resources and hazardous materials as follows:

Historic Resources

There are four historic resources located within 90 feet of the Development Site, and thus would be within the area of potential construction-related project impacts:

- West Farms Soldier Cemetery. The cemetery is located within 90 feet of proposed buildings 1B and 1D on Parcel 1.
- New Tabernacle Baptist Church. The New Tabernacle Church is located within 90 feet of proposed building 1B on Parcel 1.
- Beck Memorial Presbyterian Church. The Beck Memorial Presbyterian Church is located within 90 feet of building 3A on Parcel 3.
- The former Peabody Home for Aged and Indigent Women. This resource is located within 90 feet of the Lambert Houses open space that would be located on Parcel 5.

Therefore, to avoid inadvertent demolition and/or construction-related damage to these resources from ground-borne construction-period vibrations, falling debris, collapse, etc., these buildings would be included in a CPP for historic structures that would be prepared in coordination with SHPO and LPC and implemented in consultation with a licensed professional engineer. The CPP would be prepared as set forth in Section 523 of the *CEQR Technical Manual* and in compliance with the procedures included in the DOB's TPPN #10/88 and LPC's *Guidelines for Construction Adjacent to a Historic Landmark* and *Protection Programs for Landmark Buildings*. Provisions of the 2014 New York City Building Code also provide protection measures for all properties against accidental damage from adjacent construction by requiring that all buildings, lots, and service facilities adjacent to foundation and earthwork areas be protected and supported. Further, Building Code Chapter 3309.4.4 requires that "historic structures that are contiguous to or within a lateral distance of 90 feet…from the edge of the lot where an excavation is occurring" be monitored during the course of excavation work. The CPP would be prepared and implemented prior to demolition and construction activities on the development site and project-related demolition and construction activities would be monitored as specified in the CPP.

Hazardous Materials

Former uses within (or near) Development Site may have impacted subsurface conditions; and the existing residential and/or former commercial spaces may have used and stored oil for heating purposes and the structures may contain ACM, LBP, and/or PCB-containing materials. Demolition of the existing structures and excavation activities associated with new construction could disturb these hazardous materials and potentially increase pathways for human or environmental exposure. Potential impacts would be avoided through the mapping of an E-designation for hazardous materials on each parcel and

implementing a series of measures that would address the potential for contamination at the Development Site. With these measures, construction of the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials.

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Consistent with Executive Order 12898 (EO 12989), which requires federal agencies to consider whether actions they might fund or approve may have any disproportionately high and adverse environmental or human health effects on low-income or minority populations, an analysis was undertaken. The analysis identified that the study area's block groups are minority communities, with minority rates ranging from 99.4 percent to 100.0 percent. The majority of the study area's block groups are also low-income communities. Based on a review of the project's environmental effects and given all the facts and circumstances, the Proposed Project is not expected to result in any disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and low-income populations. The Proposed Project would have an overall positive effect by improving the quality of life for current Lambert Houses residents while increasing the number of affordable units on the Development Site.

E. ALTERNATIVES

A total of three alternatives were assessed to determine whether they would substantively meet the stated purpose and need of the Proposed Actions while reducing or eliminating its adverse impacts:

- A No Action Alternative, which is mandated by CEQR and SEQRA, and is intended to provide the lead and involved agencies with an assessment of the expected environmental impacts of no action on their part. The No Action Alternative assumes that the Lambert Houses development remains in its current condition.
- A No School Alternative, which assumes that the 500-seat school proposed for Parcel 10 is not constructed. In the No School Alternative, an additional 55 units of housing would be developed on Parcel 10 instead. Parcels 1, 3, and 5 would be developed as they would be with the Proposed Project.
- A No Unmitigated Significant Adverse Impact Alternative, which considers a project program that would eliminate the Proposed Project's unmitigated significant adverse impacts in the areas of public intermediate schools, shadows, and transportation.

The analytical conclusions of each alternative, as compared to the Proposed Project, are summarized below.

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The No Action Alternative assumes no discretionary actions would occur. The Development Site would remain in its existing condition and the Proposed Project would not be implemented. This condition is the "future without the Proposed Project" or the "No Action" condition, and it is used in other chapters of the FEIS as the baseline against which impacts of the Proposed Project are measured. While the No Action Alternative would avoid all of the significant adverse environmental impacts of the Proposed Actions, it

would not achieve the Proposed Actions' purpose and need, which includes improving the quality of life for current Lambert Houses residents while increasing the number of affordable housing units and

neighborhood retail space on the Development Site, as well as the possible development of a new 500 seat elementary school for the neighborhood.

NO SCHOOL ALTERNATIVE

The No School Alternative would result in the same development as the Proposed Project with the exception of Parcel 10. Under the No School Alternative, if the SCA were to decline to exercise the option to build a new elementary school on Parcel 10, a residential building with approximately 55 units would be constructed in its place. Overall, the No School Alternative would redevelop the Development Site with the following:

- A total of 1,720 residential units at the completion of the project, for an increment of 989 units over the No Action condition. The proposed residential units would all be affordable.
- Approximately 61,100 sf of retail, for an increment of 21,610 sf over the No Action condition.
- A reduction in the amount of parking at the site, for a total of 110 spaces.

The No School Alternative would result in substantially similar effects as the Proposed Project with the exception of schools. The 55 additional units of affordable housing would be consistent with the stated purpose and need of the Proposed Actions. However, this alternative would result in significant adverse impacts on both elementary and intermediate schools and would not provide any school seats to accommodate the Proposed Project's increase in population.

As discussed further below under Section F and in FEIS Chapter 21, "Mitigation," the potential for significant adverse impacts to elementary and intermediate schools under this alternative (and under the Proposed Actions) would be fully mitigated through the Department of Education's (DOE) commitment to monitoring enrollment at both the elementary and intermediate school level during the remaining years of the current Five-Year Capital Plan for Fiscal Years 2015-2019 and the two succeeding Five-Year Capital Plans for Fiscal Years 2020-2024 and Fiscal Years 2024-2029.

NO UNMITIGATED SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ALTERNATIVE

As discussed below and in FEIS Chapter 21, "Mitigation," the Proposed Project would result in unmitigated significant adverse impacts related to shadows and traffic. Therefore, alternatives were developed to explore modifications to the Proposed Project that would allow for the mitigation of these impacts.

SHADOWS

As discussed above and in FEIS Chapter 6, "Shadows," and Chapter 21, "Mitigation," the shadow study concluded that new project-generated shadows would be cast on the east façade windows of the Beck Memorial Presbyterian Church, adjacent to Parcel 3 at 980 East 180th Street, and that given the substantial extent and duration of incremental shadows, the Proposed Project could cause significant adverse shadow impacts to the windows, if they are uncovered by shutters and viewable from within a public space in the church interior. The shadow study also concluded that new project shadow would result in significant adverse impacts on River Park.

To avoid the potential impact to the adjacent church windows and to River Park, the buildings on Parcels 1, 3, and 5 would need to be substantially smaller than currently designed. The reduction in height necessary to eliminate the potential shadows impact would be substantial, and would result in the

construction of fewer affordable housing units, and would thus not meet the goals of the Proposed Project.

TRANSPORTATION

Of the unmitigatable significant adverse traffic impacts identified for the Proposed Project, those at the East Tremont Avenue and Boston Road/West Farm Road intersection were determined to be the most severe. Because the impacts at this intersection would involve multiple lane groups/movements, there are limited options available to mitigate every impact. To avoid these unmitigatable impacts, the Proposed Project would have to reduce in scope to a level such that a detailed traffic analysis could be screened out, thereby concluding that there would not be a potential for any significant adverse traffic impacts.

In examining the programmatic distribution of the proposed land uses, this alternative would likely involve no redevelopment of Site 10 and an overall modest increase in dwelling units among one or more of the other Development Sites. It is also assumed that this alternative would not result in the introduction of a school, expansion of the existing supermarket, and changes in local retail uses among the various Development Sites. An increase of 360 dwelling units would correlate with incremental vehicle trips below the *CEQR Technical Manual* threshold of 50 peak hour vehicle trips to warrant any additional traffic analysis. This alternative would therefore not result in any of the significant adverse and unmitigatable impacts identified for the Proposed Project.

However, the parking shortfall identified for the Proposed Project would also occur under this alternative. As with the Proposed Project, the parking shortfall would not constitute a significant adverse parking impact due to the Proposed Project's proximity to multiple transit options and the excess parking demand is expected to be accommodated by parking facilities outside of the ¼-mile parking study area (minimum of 670 out of more than 5,000 spaces available within ½-mile of the Development Site).

F. MITIGATION

Where potential significant adverse impacts have been identified—in the areas of community facilities (public schools), shadows (on historic resources and open space), and transportation (vehicular traffic, pedestrians)—measures are examined to minimize or eliminate the anticipated impacts to the fullest extent practicable. These mitigation measures are discussed below.

Areas in which the Proposed Project would result in significant adverse impacts that cannot be fully mitigated through reasonably practicable measures are discussed below under Section G and FEIS Chapter 22, "Unavoidable Adverse Impacts."

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

The Proposed Project includes the option to construct a new public elementary school (grades kindergarten through fifth) of approximately 86,608 square feet on a portion of Parcel 10, subject to approvals and requirements of the School Construction Authority (SCA). This school would increase the elementary school capacity of Sub-district 2/CSD 12 by 500 seats and would accommodate all project-generated demand for elementary school seats. With the development of the proposed public elementary school on Parcel 10, the Proposed Project would introduce more new capacity than elementary school students. As a result, the Proposed Project would decrease the elementary school utilization rate by

approximately 3.55 percentage points. Therefore, because the Proposed Actions would not increase elementary school utilization rate, the Proposed Project would not result in a significant adverse impact on elementary schools in the study area.

The FEIS analyzes an alternative (the "No School Alternative") which replaces the proposed school on parcel 10 with an additional 55 residential units. As described above under Section E and in FEIS Chapter 20, "Alternatives," the FEIS discloses the potential for significant adverse impacts to elementary schools under this alternative. To mitigate this potential impact, the SCA will continue its efforts to secure sites for the seats that have already been funded for this subdistrict. Furthermore, elementary school enrollment in Sub-district 2/CSD 12 will be monitored by DOE during the remaining years of the current Five-Year Capital Plan for Fiscal Years 2015-2019 and the two succeeding Five-Year Capital Plans for Fiscal Years 2020-2024 and Fiscal Years 2024-2029. If a need for additional capacity is identified, DOE will evaluate the appropriate timing and mix of measures to address increased school enrollment. The various measures utilized by DOE to address increased school enrollments include: relocating DOE administrative functions to other sites, thereby freeing up space for classrooms; restructuring or reprogramming existing school space within the district and, development of additional public school capacity through new construction or expansion of existing school facilities. If additional school construction is warranted, and funding is available, it will be identified in the Five-Year Capital Plan that covers the period in which the capacity need would occur (see FEIS Appendix 21).

The applicant, Phipps Houses, is in discussions with SCA and will continue to work with SCA to determine appropriate terms for the proposed 500-seat elementary school as the phased project is constructed; these terms will be formalized in a Letter of Intent (LOI).

INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS

The intermediate school students introduced by the Proposed Project would increase utilization in Sub-district 2/CSD 12 by 8.01 percent compared with the No Action condition. The Proposed Project would result in an increase in the intermediate school utilization rate of more than 5 percentage points, and therefore the Proposed Project would result in a significant adverse impact on intermediate schools.

To mitigate the identified intermediate schools impact, the SCA will continue its efforts to secure sites for the seats that have already been funded for this subdistrict. Furthermore, intermediate school enrollment in Sub-district 2/CSD 12 will be monitored by DOE during the remaining years of the current Five-Year Capital Plan for Fiscal Years 2015-2019 and the two succeeding Five-Year Capital Plans for Fiscal Years 2020-2024 and Fiscal Years 2024-2029. If a need for additional capacity is identified, DOE will evaluate the appropriate timing and mix of measures to address increased school enrollment. The various measures utilized by DOE to address increased school enrollments include: relocating DOE administrative functions to other sites, thereby freeing up space for classrooms; restructuring or reprogramming existing school space within the district and, development of additional public school capacity through new construction or expansion of existing school facilities. If additional school construction is warranted, and funding is available, it will be identified in the Five-Year Capital Plan that covers the period in which the capacity need would occur (See FEIS Appendix 21).

SHADOWS

As discussed above and in FEIS Chapter 6, "Shadows," the shadow study concluded that new project-generated shadows would be cast on the east façade windows of the Beck Memorial Presbyterian Church, adjacent to Parcel 3 at 980 East 180th Street. The church has been determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places and as a New York City Landmark.

The church's east façade windows would receive between two and a quarter and four and a half hours of incremental shadow in the mornings, depending on the season. At times, the new shadow would eliminate the remaining sunlight from the east windows of the church. Therefore, given the substantial extent and duration of incremental shadows, the analysis identified that the proposed project could cause significant adverse shadow impacts to the windows, if they are uncovered by shutters and viewable from within a public space in the church interior.

Site visits in late 2015 and early 2016 found the structure to be boarded up with plywood and locked, and all its windows sheathed in metal. Additional research found that services are no longer held in the building; that the building has been boarded up and locked for at least four years; and that the windows were covered up because of the building's generally unsafe condition. No information is currently available regarding plans to re-open or make building repairs in the near future or by the 2029 build year for the proposed project. Therefore, since no mitigation measures can be identified at this time to address the potential shadows impact, and the impact would remain unmitigated.

The shadow study also concluded that River Park, adjacent to Parcels 1, 3 and 5 of the Development Site, would receive approximately six hours of new shadows in the mid-day and afternoons of the fall, winter and early spring, and the use of the park during these times could consequently be significantly impacted. In the late spring and summer, new shadows on River Park would be more limited in duration and extent but would still be substantial in the final hour of the analysis day and would cause significant adverse impacts in those seasons. HPD, DCP, and DPR explored measures to mitigate this impact between publication of the DEIS and FEIS and concluded that to avoid the potential impact to the adjacent church windows and to River Park, the buildings on Parcels 1, 3, and 5 would need to be substantially smaller than currently designed. The reduction in height necessary to eliminate the potential shadows impact would be substantial, and would result in the construction of fewer affordable housing units, and would thus not meet the goals of the project. Therefore, this impact would remain unmitigated.

TRANSPORTATION

Traffic conditions were evaluated at 16 intersections for the weekday AM, midday and PM peak hours. In the 2029 With Action condition, the proposed project would result in significant adverse traffic impacts at 7 intersections during the weekday AM peak hour, 3 intersections during the weekday midday peak hour, and 5 intersections during the weekday PM peak hour. Two out of the seven locations where significant adverse traffic impacts are predicted to occur could be fully mitigated with the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures shown in **Tables 11 through 13.** However, the significant adverse impacts at the intersections of East Tremont Avenue and Boston Road/West Farms Road, East Tremont Avenue and Devoe Avenue/East 177th Street, East 177th Street and Sheridan Expressway, East 178th Street and Boston Road, and East 180th Street and Boston Road could not be fully mitigated during one or more analysis peak hours.

Table 11
Recommended Mitigation Measures - Weekday AM Peak Hour

Intersection	No Action Signal Timing	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Recommended Signal Timing
East 180th Street and Boston Road	EB/WB: Green = 55 s NB/SB: Green = 55 s	Unmitigated	No change from No Action
East 180th Street and Devoe Avenue	EB/WB: Green = 55 s NB/SB: Green = 55 s	Shift 2 seconds of green time from the NB phase to the EB/WB phase.	EB/WB: Green = 57 s NB/SB: Green = 53 s
East 178th Street and Boston Road	EB: Green = 31 s NB/SB: Green = 79 s	Shift 2 seconds of green time from the NB/SB phase to the EB phase.	EB: Green = 33 s NB/SB: Green = 77 s
East Tremont Avenue and Daly Avenue	EB/WB: Green = 79 s SB: Green = 31 s	Shift 1 second of green time from the EB/WB phase to the SB phase.	EB/WB: Green = 78 s SB: Green = 32 s
East Tremont Avenue and Boston Road/West Farms Road	EB: Green = 27 s WB: Green = 29 s NB (Boston Road): Green = 22 s NB (West Farms Road)/SB: Green = 22 s	Unmitigated	No change from No Action
East Tremont Avenue and Devoe Avenue/East 177th Street	WB Lead: Green = 15 s EB/WB: Green = 47 s NB/SB: Green = 43 s	Unmitigated	No change from No Action
East 177th Street and Sheridan Expressway	EB/SB Right-Turn: Green = 33 s WB: Green = 54 s NB/SB: Green = 16 s	Unmitigated	No change from No Action

Notes: EB = Eastbound; WB = Westbound; NB = Northbound; SB = Southbound; LPI = Leading Pedestrian Interval

Table 12
Recommended Mitigation Measures - Weekday Midday Peak Hour

Intersection	No Action Signal Timing	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Recommended Signal Timing
East Tremont Avenue and Boston Road/West Farms Road	EB: Green = 19 s WB: Green = 19 s NB (Boston Road): Green = 15 s NB (West Farms Road)/SB: Green = 17 s	Unmitigated	No change from No Action
East Tremont Avenue and Devoe Avenue/East 177th Street	WB Lead: Green = 15 s EB/WB: Green = 47 s NB/SB: Green = 43 s	Shift 2 seconds of green time from the WB phase to the NB/SB phase.	WB Lead: Green = 15 s EB/WB: Green = 45 s NB/SB: Green = 45 s
East 177th Street and Sheridan Expressway	EB/SB Right-Turn: Green = 33 s WB: Green = 48 s NB/SB: Green = 22 s	Shift 1 second of green time from the EB/SB Right-Turn phase to the NB/SB phase.	EB/SB Right-Turn: Green = 32 s WB: Green = 48 s NB/SB: Green = 23 s

Notes: EB = Eastbound; WB = Westbound; NB = Northbound; SB = Southbound; LPI = Leading Pedestrian Interval

Table 13
Recommended Mitigation Measures - Weekday PM Peak Hour

Intersection	No Action Signal Timing	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Recommended Signal Timing
East 180th Street and Boston Road	EB/WB: Green = 55 s NB/SB: Green = 55 s	Unmitigated	No change from No Action
East 178th Street and Boston Road	EB: Green = 31 s NB/SB: Green = 79 s	Unmitigated	No change from No Action
East Tremont Avenue and Boston Road/West Farms Road	EB: Green = 27 s WB: Green = 29 s NB (Boston Road): Green = 22 s NB (West Farms Road)/SB: Green = 22 s	Unmitigated	No change from No Action
East Tremont Avenue and Devoe Avenue/East 177th Street	WB Lead: Green = 15 s EB/WB: Green = 47 s NB/SB: Green = 43 s	Unmitigated	No change from No Action
East 177th Street and Sheridan Expressway	EB/SB Right-Turn: Green = 32 s WB: Green = 48 s NB/SB: Green = 23 s	Unmitigated	No change from No Action
Notes: EB = Eastbound; WB = Westbound; NB = Northbound; SB = Southbound; LPI = Leading Pedestrian Interval			

Pedestrian conditions were evaluated at 15 sidewalks, 8 corners, and 6 crosswalks for the weekday peak hours. In the 2029 With Action condition, the Proposed Project would result in significant adverse pedestrian impacts at two crosswalks during at least one weekday peak hour: both the northern and southern segments of one of these crosswalks would be impacted during the weekday AM, midday, and PM peak hours, while the other crosswalk would only be impacted during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, as summarized earlier in **Table 7.**

Recommended measures to mitigate these significant adverse pedestrian impacts are described below, and the mitigated conditions are summarized in **Table 14**.

Table 14
2029 No Action, With Action, and Mitigation Conditions
Pedestrian Level of Service Analysis

Location	Recommended Mitigation Measures	2029 No Action		2029 With Action		2029 Mitigation	
		SFP	LOS	SFP	LOS	SFP	LOS
Weekday AM Peak Hour							
North Crosswalk of East Tremont Ave and Boston Rd/West Farms Rd	Widen by 1 foot	66.0	A	22.3	D	24.4	C
East Crosswalk of East Tremont Ave and Boston Rd/West Farms Rd (North Segment)	Widen by 7.5 feet	6.5	F	4.3	F	8.5	F
East Crosswalk of East Tremont Ave and Boston Rd/West Farms Rd (South Segment)	Widen by 6.5 feet	1.5	F	0.8	F	1.4	F
Weekday Midday Peak Hour							
East Crosswalk of East Tremont Ave and Boston Rd/West Farms Rd (North Segment)	Widen by 7.5 feet	14.9	E	13.3	E	12.8	E
East Crosswalk of East Tremont Ave and Boston Rd/West Farms Rd (South Segment)	Widen by 6.5 feet	9.5	E	8.0	E	12.8	E
Weekday PM Peak Hour							
North Crosswalk of East Tremont Ave and Boston Rd/West Farms Rd	Widen by 1 foot	83.3	A	22.3	D	24.4	C
East Crosswalk of East Tremont Ave and Boston Rd/West Farms Rd (North Segment)	Widen by 7.5 feet	13.7	E	6.9	F	12.7	E
East Crosswalk of East Tremont Ave and Boston Rd/West Farms Rd (South Segment)	Widen by 6.5 feet	7.3	F	4.7	F	7.7	F
Note: SFP = square feet per pedestrian; LOS = Level of Service							

EAST TREMONT AVENUE AND BOSTON ROAD/WEST FARMS ROAD

Crosswalks

- Significant adverse impacts were identified for the north crosswalk of this intersection during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. The existing striping of this crosswalk is 42 feet in length and 15 feet in width; after the implementation of the NYCDOT intersection improvements in the No Action condition, the north crosswalk would have a striping of approximately 42 feet in length and 12 feet in width. Widening the crosswalk by 1 foot for a total width of 13 feet would mitigate the weekday AM and PM peak hour impacts. This recommended mitigation accounts for the changes in the configuration of the north crosswalk subsequent to the publication of the DEIS.
- Significant adverse impacts were identified for the north segment of the east crosswalk of this intersection during the weekday AM, midday, and PM peak hours. The existing striping of this crosswalk is 32 feet in length and 15 feet in width; after the implementation of the NYCDOT intersection improvements in the No Action condition, the north segment of the east crosswalk would have a striping of approximately 29 feet in length and 12 feet in width. Widening the crosswalk by 7.5 feet for a total width of 19.5 feet would mitigate the projected weekday AM and PM peak hour impacts.
- Significant adverse impacts were identified for the south segment of the east crosswalk of this intersection during the weekday AM, midday, and PM peak hours. The existing striping of this crosswalk is 32 feet in length and 15 feet in width; after the implementation of the NYCDOT intersection improvements in the No Action condition, the south segment of the east crosswalk would have a striping of approximately 52 feet in length and 12 feet in width. Widening the crosswalk by 6.5 feet for a total width of 18.5 feet would mitigate the projected weekday AM, midday, and PM peak hour impacts.

G. UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

Unavoidable significant adverse impacts are defined as those that meet the following two criteria:

- There are no reasonably practicable mitigation measures to eliminate the impact; and
- There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed actions that would meet the purpose and need for the actions, eliminate the impact, and not cause other or similar significant adverse impacts.

As described in Section F above and Chapter 21 of the FEIS, a number of the potential impacts identified for the Proposed Project could be mitigated. However, as described below, in some cases, impacts from the Proposed Project would not be fully mitigated.

SHADOWS

As discussed above, the shadow study concluded that new project-generated shadows would be cast on the east façade windows of the Beck Memorial Presbyterian Church, adjacent to Parcel 3 at 980 East 180th Street. The church has been determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

The church's east façade windows would receive between two and a quarter and four and a half hours of incremental shadow in the mornings, depending on the season. At times, the new shadow would eliminate

the remaining sunlight from the east windows of the church. Therefore, given the substantial extent and duration of incremental shadows, the analysis identified that the Proposed Project could cause significant adverse shadow impacts to the windows, if they are uncovered by shutters and viewable from within a public space in the church interior.

Site visits in late 2015 and early 2016 found the structure to be boarded up with plywood and locked, and all its windows sheathed in metal. Additional research found that services are no longer held in the building; that the building has been boarded up and locked for at least four years; and that the windows were covered up because of the building's generally unsafe condition. No information is currently available regarding plans to re-open or make building repairs in the near future or by the 2029 build year for the Proposed Project. Therefore, since no mitigation measures can be identified at this time to address the potential shadows impact, the impact would remain unmitigated.

The shadow study also concluded that River Park, adjacent to Parcels 1, 3 and 5 of the Development Site, would receive approximately six hours of new shadows in the mid-day and afternoons of the fall, winter and early spring, and the use of the park during these times could consequently be significantly impacted. In the late spring and summer, new shadows on River Park would be more limited in duration and extent but would still be substantial in the final hour of the analysis day and would cause significant adverse impacts in those seasons. As discussed under Section F above as well as FEIS Chapter 21, "Mitigation," no measures to mitigate this impact were identified between publication of the DEIS and FEIS, and the impact would remain unmitigated.

TRANSPORTATION

As discussed under Section F above as well as FEIS Chapter 12, "Transportation," and Chapter 21, "Mitigation," the significant adverse vehicular traffic impacts at the intersections of East Tremont Avenue and Boston Road/West Farms Road, East Tremont Avenue and Devoe Avenue/East 177th Street, East 177th Street and Sheridan Expressway, East 178th Street and Boston Road, and East 180th Street and Boston Road could not be fully mitigated during one or more analysis peak hours.

H. GROWTH INDUCING ASPECTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTIONS

The term "growth-inducing aspects" generally refers to the potential for a Proposed Project to trigger additional development in areas outside the project site that would otherwise not have such development without the Proposed Project. The 2014 *City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual* indicates that an analysis of the growth-inducing aspects of a project is appropriate when the project:

- Adds substantial new land use, new residents, or new employment that could induce additional development of a similar kind or of support uses, such as retail establishments to serve new residential uses; and/or
- Introduces or greatly expands infrastructure capacity.

The Proposed Project would be limited to the Development Site, which consists of Parcels 1, 3, 5, and 10 of the Bronx Park South Large Scale Residential Development (LSRD). The project would increase the density of the Development Site by introducing 934 more affordable residential units and 21,610 square feet more retail than in the existing condition; the project would also introduce a new 500-seat public elementary school. These uses would be consistent with the existing uses in the surrounding area. As

discussed in Chapter 3, "Socioeconomic Conditions," the new units constructed with the Proposed Project, as well as the new population those units would introduce to the study area, as a whole would generally be similar to the existing income profile of the surrounding neighborhood. The Proposed Project is not expected to introduce or accelerate a trend of changing socioeconomic conditions.

In addition, the Proposed Project would not include the introduction or expansion of infrastructure capacity (e.g., sewers, central water supply) that would result in indirect development; any proposed infrastructure improvements would be made to support development of the Development Site itself. Therefore, the Proposed Project is not expected to induce significant new growth in the surrounding area.

I. IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES

Resources, both natural and built, would be expended in the construction and operation of the Proposed Project. These resources include the materials used in construction; energy in the form of fuel and electricity consumed during construction and operation of the Lambert Houses project; and the human effort (i.e., time and labor) required to develop, construct, and operate various components of the project.

The resources are considered irretrievably committed because their reuse for some purpose other than the Proposed Project would be highly unlikely. The Proposed Project constitutes an irreversible and irretrievable commitment of the Development Site as a land resource, thereby rendering land use for other purposes infeasible, at least in the near term.

These commitments of land resources and materials are weighed against the benefits of the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project is intended to improve the quality of life for current Lambert Houses residents while increasing the number of affordable housing units on the Development Site. By creating nearly 1,000 more affordable housing units than are currently located on the site, the Proposed Project would make a substantial contribution to the housing production goals of the Mayor's *Housing New York: A Five-Borough, Ten-Year Plan*.

J. CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

The federal Council on Environmental Quality's regulations implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), set forth at 40 CFR Part 1500-1508, require federal agencies to consider the environmental consequences of their actions, including not only direct and indirect effects, but also cumulative effects. Cumulative impacts result from the incremental consequences of an action (the Proposed Project) when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions (40 CFR 1508.7).

As discussed above under "Analysis Framework" and in FEIS Chapter 1, "Project Description," the various Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) chapters address cumulative impacts by comprehensively defining the environmental setting expected in the No Action condition, including a discussion of development projects expected to be completed independent of the Proposed Project (No Action projects), and the baseline growth in the No Action condition.

To this end, the FEIS considers as the future baseline condition the combination of existing conditions together with known development plans, recent approved land use actions, public policies, projected

population and employment growth, and other general background growth. The potential impacts of the Proposed Project were assessed in comparison to the future baseline (No Action) condition.

As described in FEIS Chapter 2, "Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy," there are two planned development projects in the study area that are anticipated to be complete by 2029. Both of these projects will include affordable housing; it is expected that together they will introduce approximately 500 new units of housing. Both projects will be located south of East Tremont Avenue and are expected to be complete well before the 2029 analysis year.

The cumulative operational effects of these two projects and the Lambert Houses project are addressed in the technical chapters of the FEIS. There is very little potential for cumulative construction impacts as these two projects are located south of East Tremont Avenue; the closest part of the Development Site to these projects is Parcel 10, which would be developed later in the Proposed Project's construction period. The Proposed Project's incremental development, in combination with the No Action projects, would be consistent with the trend throughout the Bronx and other parts of the city toward reinvestment and development of affordable housing in appropriately located under-developed areas.

In summary, the Proposed Project in combination with the other future development projects evaluated throughout the FEIS would result in changes in the future conditions of the study area, and would result in certain cumulative significant adverse impacts, such as schools and transportation. Measures have been (and will continue to be) examined to minimize or eliminate the anticipated impacts. The Proposed Project would also have beneficial cumulative effects by improving the quality of life for current Lambert Houses residents while increasing the number of affordable housing units on the Development Site.

Aaron Werner, AICP
Director of Environmental Planning
City of New York - Department of Housing Preservation and Development

Cc:
John Gearrity, Eric Wilson, Ted Weinstein, Winifred Campbell, Summer Greenstein (HPD)
Callista Nazaire, Charles Mason, Jonathan Beuttler, Sara Dabbs (HPD)
Hilary Semel, Esther Brunner (MOS)
Carol Samol, Shawn Brede, Oscar Oliver-Didier, (DCP Bronx Office)
Robert Dobruskin, Olga Abinader, Annabelle Meunier (DCP EARD)
Sarah Whitham, Neera Chaterjee, John Mangin, Susan Wong (DCP)
Naim Rasheed, Shakil Ahmed, Henry Colon (DOT)
Kenrick Ou, Kelly Murphy (SCA)
Owen Wells (DPR)
Colleen Alderson (DPR)
Terrell Estesen (DEP)
Gina Santucci, Amanda Sutphin (LPC)
Jeremy Parnes, Patrick Dougherty, Judith McClain, Laura Wiles, Lisa Schreibman (NYCT)
Susan Amron (NYC Law)

Therese Fretwell (HUD)
Stephanie Lamster (EPA Region 2)
Beth Cumming, Olivia Brazee (NYS OPRHP)
Venetia Lannon (NYSDEC Region 2)
Heather Spitzberg (NYSHCR)
Len Sedney (NYSHFA)
Jeffrey Zappieri (NYS DOS)
Raju Mann (City Council Land Use Review)
Ritchie Torres (Council Member)
Ivine Galarza - District Manager, Bronx CB 6
Wendy Rodriguez - Chairperson, Bronx CB 6
Wilhelm Ronda, Office of the Bronx Borough President
James Rausse, Office of the Bronx Borough President
Adam Weinstein, Cara McAteer, Matthew Kelly (Phipps Houses)
Allison Ruddock (AKRF)